

DOUBLE NUMBER

The Christian East

A QUARTERLY REVIEW DEVOTED TO THE
STUDY OF THE EASTERN CHURCHES

SECRETARY OF EDITORIAL COMMITTEE
REV. CANON J. A. DOUGLAS, Ph.D.

Vol. XVII. Nos. 3 & 4. July-Dec., 1937. 3s.



THE ASSOCIATION OF EASTERN CHURCHES ASSOCN.

THE EASTERN PRESS, LTD.

25, Abchurch Lane, London, E.C. 4, ENGLAND. U.S.A. and Canada, 300, 31st Street, New York, N.Y.


CONTENTS.

HIS LATE BEATITUDE THE SERB PATRIARCH VARNAVA	<i>Frontispiece</i>
THE LATE SERB PATRIARCH VARNAVA. By PROFESSOR D. S. MARITCH	65
CHRONICLE AND CAUSERIE. Compiled or written by J. A. DOUGLAS	66
THE ORTHODOX DECLARATION AT EDINBURGH	78
THE EUCHARIST SACRIFICE. By THE RIGHT REVD. F. C. NUGENT HICKS, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln	81
AN INTERVIEW WITH THE LOCUM TENENS OF SERBIAN PATRIARCHATE, THE METROPOLITAN DOSITEIOS	86
LIFE AND WORK IN THE CHURCH OF GREECE. By THE GREAT ARCHIMANDRITE REVD. MICHAEL CONSTANTINIDES	88
HIGH FESTIVAL AT SIGHISOARA. By MARTIN PIERCE	95
THE COPTIC ORTHODOX CHURCH. By THE EIGHOMANOUS (i.e., CANON) IMRAHIM LUKE	99
THE SYRIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH. By CANON W. A. WIGRAM	120
OUR BOOKSHELF	125

PERIODICALS RECEIVED.

<i>Orthodox</i> . Constantinople.	<i>Revue Orthodoxe Roumaine</i> . Bucarest.
<i>Neosoma</i> . Athens.	<i>Missionary</i> . Bucarest.
<i>Orientalia Christiana</i> . Rome.	<i>The Living Church</i> . Milwaukee, U.S.A.
<i>Haravan</i> . Alexandria.	<i>The Islamic Review</i> . Woking.
<i>Neosoma</i> . Alexandria.	<i>L'Europe Orientale</i> . Rome.
<i>The Echo</i> . Jerusalem.	<i>The Aulide</i> . New York.
<i>Zerk</i> . 1184, Ierapetra 179, Athens.	<i>The Harvard Theological Review</i> . Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
<i>Tsarhosia Vasilovska</i> . Karkovica.	<i>Armenian</i> . Belgium.
<i>Glasnik</i> . Serbia.	<i>Ekklisia</i> . Athens.
<i>Od Tola Ispovest</i> . Old Kordian.	<i>Apokatastasis</i> . Cyprus.
C. Athens.	<i>Glasnik</i> . Belgrad.
<i>Nareda Svoj</i> . Bulgaria.	<i>Sion (Armenian)</i> . Palestine.

NOTES.—All communications, enquiries and subscriptions should be sent:
Rev. P. M. French, St. James's Vicarage, West Hampstead, N.W.6.





HIS LATE BEATITUDE THE SERB PATRIARCH VARNAVA

The Christian East

THE LATE SERB PATRIARCH VARNAVA.

BY PROF. D. S. MARITCH.

AT midnight between 23rd and 24th July this year died at Belgrade the Serbian Orthodox Patriarch Varnava, i.e., Barnabas. He was the second Patriarch after the restoration of the Serbian Patriarchate in 1920, and the 70th Patriarch since its creation in 1376, during the reign of the Tsar Dushan.

Patriarch Varnava was a person of outstanding importance, as holding the Throne just during the struggle which produced an enormous arising and awakening of Orthodoxy among the Serbians, owing to the unfortunate Concordat with the Roman Catholic Church in Yugoslavia.

The Patriarch Varnava was born on August 29th, 1880, at Plevlye, a small town in Old Serbia, in the neighbourhood of the birthplace of St. Sava. After preparatory education in the Theological Seminary at Prizren, Varnava went in 1900 to Russia, where he got a higher education in Petrograd's Spiritual Academy, and took a degree of Candidat in Theology in 1905. In the same year he made his monastic vows, and changed his secular name Peter (Rossitch) to Varnava (Barnabas).

After his study at the Spiritual Academy the Hieromonach Varnava left Russia and spent five years in Constantinople, as Chaplain of the Serbian Legation and the Principal of a Serbian School. In 1910, after a visit paid to Constantinople by the late Serbian King Peter I, the Archimandrite Varnava was elected by the Synod of Constantinople to be Bishop of Veles and Debar, with the honorary title of Bishop of Glavnitza, and remained in that See until the end of the Great War. During the War Bishop Varnava spent one year in Russia as a Serbian emissary, and on his way to and back from Russia was the guest of the English ecclesiastical authorities, whose kindness he appreciated greatly.

In 1920, after the restoration of the Serbian Patriarchate, Bishop Varnava was translated to the See of Skoplye (Uskub). He remained there for ten years, i.e., till April 12, 1930, when, after the death of the Patriarch Dmitri, he was elected to be Serb Patriarch.

With the Patriarch Varnava begins a new period in the Serbian Church. At his coming into power the work of the internal

organization of the Church was near its end, and its home-missionary work on a big scale began.

In the beginning of his Patriarchal power the famous Constitution of the Serbian Church was enacted and with it the fixation of clerical incomes. By these two laws the most outstanding practical problems of the life of the Serbian Church were solved and it was set free for its domestic tasks.

A noteworthy feature of the Patriarchate of the Patriarch Varnava was the building of churches all over Orthodox Yugoslavia. In Belgrade 12 churches were built, of which the largest is that of St. Sava. Many monasteries were restored and new monasteries created, most of which are for women. But the crown of the building activity of the late Patriarch is the new Patriarchal House, near the Cathedral of Belgrade, which is one of the finest buildings in Belgrade.

The death of the Patriarch Varnava is lamented throughout the Serbian Church. The present stressful crisis demanded a strong character and saintly life such as his. The mere mention of his name rouses among all Serbs the will to steadfast resistance against the attempts on the independence of the Serbian Orthodox Church. His grave at St. Sava's Church in Belgrade has become a national shrine, where gather daily thousands of Serbs to pray for him as a Martyr and to ask his intercession. By the Serbs the Patriarch Varnava is already held to be a saint.

May God bless his soul to be with the Saints of His Heaven !

CHRONICLE AND CAUSERIE.

COMPILED OR WRITTEN BY J. A. DOUGLAS.

THEIR scale, their dignity and the publicity which they received, make the Oxford and Edinburgh World Conferences the outstanding events of the past year in our proper field. Otherwise except for the courageous, stubborn and as it would seem successful resistance of the Serb Church to the ratification of a Concordat secretly negotiated by the Vatican with the Yugoslav Government, nothing striking has occurred since our last issue either in the Orthodox Church or in the sphere of Orthodox and Anglican relations.

THE ŒCUMENICAL CONFERENCES AND EDINBURGH CONFERENCES.

Many good brains and vital Christian workers were engaged at Oxford in the enterprise of deciding and stating the true relation-

ship of the Christian Church to the Community and the State and its function in them and of applying essential Christian principles to the problems of human life in the modern world. The discussions and reports of the Conference are a contribution to thought and its conclusions cannot be without influence. But it may be doubted whether it justified its title Œcumenical. To use newly coined terms, its ideology and its dialectic were predominately Anglo-Saxon. That was not the fault of the American and British delegates. It was due to the enforced absence of the Germans and to the abstention of the Roman Catholic Communion. But the fact is indisputable; and its consequence was that no-one being there to say *negotio majorem*, assumptions which are challenged in Germany or are rejected throughout Latin Christendom passed as truisms. It is hard to conceive, e.g., that if Roman Catholicism or German Lutheranism had been there in force, the treatment of the relationship between Church and State or of War and Peace by this Conference would have been on the same lines or that its findings therein would not have been marked by notes of disagreement.

One of my most vivid recollections of the Lausanne Faith and Order Conference in 1927 is of Bishop Gore—afterwards he told me that if he rendered it no other service, he rendered it a great service thereby—rising again and again to remind us that since Roman Christendom embraces something like a majority of World Christianity, it could not be left out of account in any Œcumenical Movement for Reunion. The precedents created by the kindly greeting extended officially to the Edinburgh Conference by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Edinburgh, by a warm and cordial message from the monks of Amay and by the attendance, though in a private capacity, of Roman Catholic observers, gave great delight and satisfaction. None the less, *aus den Augen aus dem Sinne*, Lutheran Germany and Latin Christendom were well nigh as absent from the corporate mind of the Edinburgh Conference as they were absent physically from its sessions.

THE EDINBURGH CONFERENCE.

If I may make the estimate, the Edinburgh Conference did all the better work just because it was predominantly Anglo-Saxon. As was that of its predecessor at Lausanne its prime function was to examine in what respects the Christian Churches are in agreement or disagreement as to the essentials of Faith and Order and to formulate its conclusions.

At Lausanne the Œcumenical Movement was still young and in its freshness there was an impulse to achieve large results at once. In consequence the method adopted was to survey the whole field of Faith and Order under six headings by six sections of the

Conference. The six Reports which those sections made to the plenum, presented an apparent agreement. But when the notes of disagreement appended to them were studied, it became plain that that agreement covered directly conflicting and unreconciled antinomies. The situation was saved by a Declaration on the part of the Orthodox which, if I may be forgiven the vain glory, it was my singular privilege to translate into English at the bidding of Archbishop Germanos of Thyatira. That Declaration which was reinforced by *mutatis mutandis* like declarations from the Old Catholics and—all honour to them—the Quakers, told the Conference roundly that the way to Reunion is not to conceal fundamental differences by the ambiguous use of words but to face them. Accordingly, except for the first Report, i.e., the *Message of the Gospel*—and in spite of the glorious words (the pen that drafted it was that of that soul the German, Lutheran Adolf Deissman, R.I.P.), in which it is set forth, I was surprised then and am still surprised that they allowed it to pass without reservation—the Orthodox delegates disassociated themselves from the Reports. By doing so they saved the Conference from presenting Reports to the churches which might have been interpreted as expressing a general dogmatic agreement qualified only by certain disagreements. That might well have torpedoed the Ecumenical Movement.

At Edinburgh there was no risk of that kind. The lesson of Lausanne had been learnt. The method of the Conference determined by its Continuation Committee was to get behind precised dogmatic disagreements between the churches and examine how far beneath them there is a common rationale or agreement. Nor was the whole *Corpus Dogmaticum* dealt with. The field explored though larger than could receive more than partial exploration was specified and limited to the Word of God, the Doctrine of Grace and the Ministry and the Sacraments. Commissions comprising typical theologians and assembled by chairmen appointed by the Continuation Committee had prepared the ground, the result of their labour being that three notable volumes presenting synopses of all the principal types of Christian thought upon the three subjects were ready for the Conference.

The book on the Word of God was produced by a German Commission under Dr. Stahlin. The regrettable absence of the German Lutherans at Edinburgh was particularly felt in the section which worked upon this subject. The other two books on Grace and on the Ministry and Sacraments were produced by Commissions under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Gloucester who dealt with the Ecumenical Movement in particular and the cause of Christian Reunion in general and whose unquenchable vision, enthusiasm and drive is inestimable.

To appraise the permanent value of the three Edinburgh doctrinal Reports would be a rash undertaking. It is possible that like the Lausanne Reports they will be forgotten at the next Faith and Order Conference. It is possible that—and especially the Report on Grace which embodies something like an agreed rationale—they may furnish starting points for its labours.

But at any rate they cannot be charged with presenting artificial agreements based on equivocal compromises.

THE CRUX AT LAUSANNE AND EDINBURGH.

According to the mind in which the Edinburgh Conference adjourned, and let us hope that that mind will persist—the next Faith and Order Conference will face up to the fact that even to talk of the Reunion of the Christian Churches must be a matæology until those who discuss it are agreed as to what they mean by Reunion, by the churches and by *the Church*.

To plough the sands is a convention for profitless labour. But if it produces a team spirit among those engaged in it, though it produces nothing else, it can be wonderfully profitable.

As to whether so far as producing dogmatic agreement among the Churches the Lausanne and Edinburgh Conferences were merely indulging in that pastime, only the future can determine. But in any case, they have acquired a team spirit which should enable them to handle the most thorny questions.

That in effect there has been a basic cleavage in the Faith and Order Movement from the beginning, no one who has had part in it can doubt. It is as well, however, that the stating of it formally in the Conference has been delayed hitherto. The fact that the Edinburgh Conference was predominantly Anglo-Saxon brought it into a prominence which could not be overlooked.

On the one hand to some the Church is a unique, visible society. Whatever diversity may exist in its unity, it is recognizable by outward marks as the one mystic fellowship which Christ founded. To depart from it is to abandon that fellowship and the mystic life which is sustained in it.

To them Reunion is a necessity and means the uniting of the Churches to be a single Church with a co-ordinated visible life and system, which has a single Faith and a single Ministry and which lives by the same Holy Scriptures and the same Sacraments.

On the other hand to others the Church is to be identified with no visible society.

It is a mystic fellowship founded by Christ. The membership of which can be known to Him alone. Every faithful believer in Him and none other is a member of it. The churches, each and all, are only expressions of *the Church* so far as their individual

members work by Faith in Him and bring forth fruit according to His Will.

To this the uniting of the "churches" in a single society, even if to be sought for the sake of clarity or efficiency, is not a necessity. Reunion means no more than their recognition of existing facts by throwing open their spiritual privileges and intimacies to each other, and by the fullest co-operation. Its requirement is not Unification but Federation.

The antinomy is exemplified by the postulates of the latter that the Table of Holy Communion being the Table of the Lord wherever and however it is faithfully celebrated, all true believers have an indefeasible right to partake of the Lord's Supper; and of the former that all Sacraments are consecrated mysteries of the Church and that in particular the Eucharist which is to her the very Sacrament of her unity can only rightly be celebrated by those whom she ordains to be its ministers and by those who are admitted to her Communion.

To prepare for the registration if not for the resolution of that antinomy will be the labour of the Continuation Committee for the next ten years.

THE ORTHODOX AT EDINBURGH.

As at Lausanne so at Edinburgh, though they numbered a bare score among six hundred, the Orthodox rendered incalculable service to the Œcumenical Movement. It is true that in some matters they did not speak with one voice but again and again alike in the Sections and in the plenum one or other of them made plain on which side of the dividing line is the Orthodox Communion and that for it Reunion means the unification of the churches to be one visible Church and that its indispensable preliminary is full dogmatic agreement. And though they decided that they were under no necessity as at Lausanne to refuse to allow the Edinburgh Reports to be commended for the consideration of the churches, as at Lausanne they made an admirable and clear Declaration which is printed elsewhere in this issue of *The Christian East*.

THE ORTHODOX DELEGATES.

The Concordat crisis in Yugoslavia deprived both the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences of the delegates of the Serb Patriarchate and—I gather that the decision that they should not go on was the consequence of the vague and unsubstantiated charges against the Rumanian Orthodox Church, of Anti-Semitism and of persecuting the Baptists, Seventh Day Adventists and other sects of Slav origin in Rumania with which the air at Oxford had been

filled but with which in a tangible form they had *not* been confronted—the Rumanian delegates did not come on to Edinburgh. Without pledging myself to do so, I am minded in a future issue of *The Christian East* to show that the charges disseminated against the Rumanian Church at Oxford were baseless and tendencious slanders and that however innocent were their acceptance and repetition, they were the perverted product of deliberate and skilful Press and other propaganda. But whether or not I do so, I submit here and now in *The Christian East* that those who set afloat these charges as whispers in the couloirs of the Oxford Conference did so at no small risk of injury to the Œcumenical Movement and to the cause of the solidarity of the Christian churches. If they had possessed evidence to prove that those charges were valid, their right and indeed their business was to produce it and to indict the Rumanian Church to the Conference. But they did neither. That being so, no-one could be surprised if the Rumanian Church and, either in sympathy with it or in alarm at this prospect of like treatment, her sister Orthodox Churches withdrew altogether from the Œcumenical Movement and in result that Movement became torpedoed and collapsed.

In spite of its limitation, the Orthodox delegates at Edinburgh as at Oxford formed a distinguished delegation. The Metropolitan Dyonisie himself represented the Orthodox Church of Poland. Professor Alivisatos who is the most outstanding and authoritative Orthodox Theologian in the Œcumenical Movement, and with him his colleague, Professor Bratsiotes, of Athens University, and the Great Archimandrite Constantinides, made exactly that contribution which theologians of the Greek Church may be relied upon to make. Always helpful and conciliatory, they were none the less always definite and while modern in the best sense, never failed to make plain the traditional dogmatic positions of Orthodoxy. The Metropolitan Stepan, of Sofia, whose striking personality reinforces his rank in the Bulgarian hierarchy, had with him Professor Zankov, the Dean of the Cathedral, whose lectures on the Orthodox Church given in Berlin are familiar to German and Anglo-Saxon readers and make him a *persona gratissima*. The Metropolitan Evlogie came to Edinburgh, and Bishop Seraphim of Vienna represented Metropolitan Anastassy and his jurisdiction in both Conferences. As always at Œcumenical gatherings the Russian Academy of Paris supplied a strong team, both at Oxford and Edinburgh. Professor Bulgakov took a less prominent part at Edinburgh than at Lausanne but the great influence which he has acquired in the Œcumenical Movement was maintained and he had his reward for the unfaltering and proper insistence with which he has all along

and for many years persisted and contended that the place of the Blessed Virgin in the Divine Purpose revealed in the Incarnation and the reverence due to her as the Mother of God are major and not minor issues.

In its final form, it is true. The Report of the Edinburgh Conference upon that matter did no more than note the sharply conflicting antinomies which divide World Christianity and instruct the Faith and Order Continuation to prepare the ground for their consideration—and let us hope for their resolution—at the next Faith and Order Conference. But it was due to Professor Bulgakov first that the Edinburgh Conference addressed itself to that matter at all and then, that unless the precise instruction of the Edinburgh Conference is ignored by its Continuation Committee, that matter must be in the forefront of the agenda of the next Faith and Order Conference. Whatever other troubles he has, Professor Bulgakov must have rejoiced at that fruit of his labours and merits our gratitude and congratulations. In the past decade Professor Florovsky's frequent lecture tours in Great Britain had made him known to a continually increasing circle as being a persuasive interpreter of Russian Orthodoxy with a contribution to make to the thought of our day and also had familiarized him with our ideology. At Edinburgh where he was a frequent speaker—his facility in the English language is complete—he had the ear of the Conference from the start. Though he often maintained positions which conflicted with the convictions and works of a majority of the delegates, his personal charm, sincerity and charity always secured him a welcome and sympathetic attention. The influence which he acquired at Oxford should make him a factor in the future of the Œcumenical Movement. It is good news that he intends to spend next spring and summer in Athens in order to familiarize himself with modern Greek Orthodox life and thought and will be attached to the Theological Faculty of the University of Athens.

Archbishop Antony Bashir, who is in charge of the Orthodox Syrians in America, represented the Patriarchate of Antioch very acceptably.

Archbishop Germanos, of Thyatira, is one of the fathers of the Œcumenical Movement. At Oxford and Edinburgh as always his great experience and his wise leadership of the Orthodox delegates and the universal affection in which he is held had not a little to do with the success of the Conferences. His fame in the Churches grows continually.

OTHER EASTERN DELEGATES.

The most picturesque figure in the two Conferences was the Syrian Orthodox Catholicos Basileios, of South India, who with

his two Rambans, the Abo Alexios and the Abo Thoma, was the invariable target of the Press photographers. The Abo Alexios, who spent 1936 in England as the guest of the Church of England Council, on Foreign Relations, went home in August with the Catholicos. The Abo Thoma is remaining for a year as the guest of the Cowley Fathers. With the authority of the Catholics, the Abo Alexios made a noteworthy statement at Edinburgh on the lines of the Orthodox Declaration.

Canon Luka, who was the delegate of the Coptic Church, is a leader in its life and action in the Egyptian Fellowship of Unity which is an Ecumenical Movement *in petto*. His sketch of the Coptic Church which is published in this number of *The Christian East* was written for the information of delegates to the Edinburgh Conference.

HOSPITALITY AND SERVICES DURING THE CONFERENCES.

Of the nature of the case, there was little scope for public hospitality to the Orthodox and other Eastern delegates to the Conferences. At Oxford by a series of At Homes in his delightful garden in Christ Church, Bishop Allen gave them very many contacts. During the intercalary week, two memorable luncheons were given in their honour; one at Sion College by its President, Rev. A. J. Macdonald, D.D., at which among the guests to meet them were the Right Hon. L. S. Amery, M.P., Lord Daryngton, and the Bishops of London and Southwark and the other for the A.E.C.A. in the House of Lords by Lords Noel, Buxton and Dickinson.

The established Church of Scotland being Presbyterian, the only special Anglican function during the Conference was the sung celebration of the Eucharist in Edinburgh Cathedral on Sunday, August 6, when the Archbishop of York was the celebrant and the Archbishop of Dublin, the preacher. So far as I am aware, that service had no precedent in this: the long procession of priests and bishops taking part in the Conference with which it started, included all the Orthodox and other Eastern, all the Old Catholic and all the Swede delegates. Sixteen Orthodox and other non-Anglican bishops in choir habit walked in it, making with the Anglican bishops a total of thirty-seven.

On the succeeding Sunday, with only a few exceptions, not only practically all the Anglican delegates but the Old Catholic, Swede and other Eastern delegates attended the Orthodox Celebration of the Liturgy in Holy Trinity Church which was lent to them by the Bishop of Edinburgh. Archbishop Germanos celebrated.

THE CHRISTIAN EAST

THE PROPOSED WORLD COUNCIL.

The Oxford Conference sent on to the Edinburgh Conference a proposal to set up a World Council on which all churches taking part in the Ecumenical Movement and accepting Nicene Christology would be represented. In consequence of hesitations urged especially by the Bishop of Gloucester, only a first reading approval was given to that proposal and it was decided that the churches represented in the two Conferences should be invited to send representatives to a meeting in Holland next May at which the idea will be explored and if agreement can be reached, a scheme be prepared and submitted to the churches for acceptance or rejection.

THE YUGOSLAV CONCORDAT.

It is significant that the draft of the Concordat with the Vatican which King Alexander is said to have agreed and initialled has not been published, and that after his murder in 1933 its terms appear to have been reconsidered. That King Alexander who was as strong as he was wise would have agreed to the document which was eventually negotiated by Cardinal Pacelli appears impossible. That document was signed in 1935, but was kept secret until last spring when, in order to be enacted by the Yugoslav Parliament, it had to be published. Its extraordinarily mediæval character was evident in the fact that it placed the Roman Catholic Church in the position of a sovereign power in Yugoslavia and its provisions in regard to mixed marriages, education, the privileged position of the Roman Catholic clergy and so on aroused a storm.

Croats and Slovenes who are Roman Catholics, interpreted it as a price paid to secure the Vatican exercising its influence to tone down their demand for Home Rule. On the other hand the Serbs who are Orthodox almost to a man were even more disturbed by the fear that the Concordat represented only an instalment of the programme of the Vatican, than they were indignant at its actual terms, monstrous though they were. Yugoslavia is under a Dictatorship and its Parliamentary elections are "made." A Roman Catholic priest, Father Koroshetz, had been made Home Minister and used his absolute powers ruthlessly and brutally. He ordered the military to break up any and every meeting called to discuss it. He suppressed the papers which criticized upon it and had every mention of it cut out of them so that even *Glasnik*, the official organ of the Serb Patriarchate had to appear with blanks on most pages. But it was soon plain that Cardinal Pacelli had made the old mistake of Vatican diplomacy and had driven a bargain which the Regency could not carry out. The Patriarch

Varnava, whose simple saintly life endeared him to all Serbs and whose ardent and faithful loyalty to the Cause of Yugoslav Union had made him a national hero, forbade the people to resort to violence but himself took every risk of open opposition to the Concordat. The Metropolitan Dositei of Zagreb, Bishop Nicolai Velimirovic and Bishop Iriney of Dalmatia and other leaders of the Serb Church followed his example. The Serb Holy Synod pronounced that any Orthodox who supported the Concordat was liable to excommunication, and excommunicated the Prime Minister and all other Orthodox Ministers of the State who had part in it. As the day for its enactment by the Serb Parliament came near, there was an expectation that Father Koroshetz who had already laid many Orthodox priests and laymen by the heels, might order the arrest of the Patriarch and his brother bishops. If he had done so, loyal beyond words though the Serbs are to their boy king and emphatic though the Patriarch's command was that they should abstain from violent resistance, anything might have happened. But at the height of the crisis, the Patriarch Varnava fell ill and died. In fact, though, except for the intense mental agitation which the necessity of choosing whether to hold his people fast or to surrender his duty had caused him he might have lived for many years, his death was rightly diagnosed as due to natural causes and no one attached credence to the report that he had been poisoned by order of the Vatican. But the Serb nation rightly and inevitably laid his death at the door of Father Koroshetz and the Concordat. The Yugoslav Premier who was never believed to have been anxious to force through the Concordat, promptly announced that its consideration by the Yugoslav Parliament was postponed indefinitely. Probably he was glad and relieved to be forced and enabled to do so. But, and of the nature of the case, especially because Father Koroshetz retained his office, the leaders of the Serb Nation and Church were constrained to demand definite guarantees that it was truly abandoned and would not be received in another form. Moreover they are concerned in honour that the priests and lay folk whom Father Koroshetz had placed in prison should be released. Accordingly, the Serb Holy Synod refused to proceed to elect a new Patriarch and appointed the Metropolitan Dositei of Zagreb to act as the *locum tenens* of the Patriarchate. At the end of January, 1938, when I am writing, the position is that the Yugoslav Premier has announced that he has no intention to force the Concordat through the Yugoslav Parliament but that the Metropolitan Dositei has reported that until the Vatican has agreed that the Concordat is dead and until Father Koroshetz had released and compensated his prisoners, the Serb Holy Synod will maintain its passive resistance and will not elect a new Patriarch.

THE ASSYRIANS.

At last the League of Nations has had pity on the Assyrians and has told them that it cannot do what it declared in 1933 must and would be done and that having vainly searched the whole world to find them a home, it can only bid them stay where they are.

That the League ought to have confessed its failure was plain eighteen months ago when the Ghab scheme broke down. Its having kept the unhappy Assyrians waiting with a hope which it knew could not be realized, is almost past pardon and justifies those of us who from the beginning urged the Assyrians not to go to Geneva.

The only thing for the Assyrians now is to face facts, to settle down where they are and contriving somehow to continue to exist to wait for better times. It is possible, indeed, that the Iraqis who have always resented the League being brought in and recognize Great Britain's interest in the Assyrians, may give the 16,000 who remain in Iraq a square deal. The position of the 9,000 in the Khabur district of Syria where they are near to the Turkish border and to Bedouin Arabs, is dangerous and the poverty of its soil hardly promises them a livelihood. But they are great-hearted and will not despair.

Talking of the Assyrians in the Khabur, I am sorry that we printed in our last issue the translation from an Arab journal of a putative interview with an English lady who had visited them. That journal's name *Saout-el-Ahrar*—the Voice of Truth—is belied by the fact that the lady indignantly repudiates the interview. In particular she bids me say that she formed the highest estimate of the Khabur's Camp Commandant and Medical Officer and their work and that she has no criticism but rather praise of the Trustees.

One thing is clear and it is that as soon as possible money and much money should be raised by the Anglican Commission in order if and when the Patriarch and Mar Joseph, the Metropolitan, who is in Iraq decide that the time is ripe, they may be able to build schools and churches for their people and to equip them with priests and teachers. Otherwise the Assyrian Church may die and its epitaph may be sacred to the memory of the Apostolic Church of the East which after nineteen centuries of life perished of its friendship with Great Britain.

Our immediate business is to strengthen the hands of their great and faithful friend, the Archbishop of Canterbury, in raising money to help them. To the Archbishop above everyone, the Assyrian Patriarch, his Nation and their friends, owe an inestimable debt for unflinching devotion to their cause. The way to repay him is not by words but by answering his appeal with cash down.

VISITORS TO ATHENS.

The Archbishop of York is to lay the foundation stone of the proposed Anglican Cathedral in Cairo of which a picture appeared and with it an appeal that is still open for donations, in our last issue. On his way to Egypt, his Grace will spend Palm Sunday in Athens which will be visited about the same time by the Bishop of Southwark who will lecture on the Church of England to the Athens branch of the Anglo-Hellenic Society.

THE ABYSSINIAN CHURCH.

A censorship fog rests upon Abyssinia. In October the Abuna Cyrillos was summoned by Signor Mussolini to Rome where he was pressed to order the Abyssinians under pain of excommunication to renounce allegiance to the Negus, and to swear allegiance to the King of Italy. On his refusal, he was put on an Italian warship to be taken back to Abyssinia. At Port Said he managed to evade his guard and got ashore. The Egyptian Government being unwilling to hand him over, he is now in Cairo. The Italian Government promptly declared him deposed and appointed as his successor Amba Auraham, the only survivor of the five Abyssinians whom at the insistence of the present Negus the Coptic Patriarch consecrated in 1927 to be coadjutor-bishops of the Abuna. Amba Auraham who, thanks to an Italian poison-gas bomb is blind and infirm, is stated to have consecrated three Abyssinian priests as bishops at the bidding of Marshal Graziani and declaring the Abyssinian Church autokephalous, to have renounced the Coptic Patriarch's jurisdiction. The Coptic Patriarch in full Synod has consequently excommunicated him and all Abyssinians who have dealings with him. Except in the lowlands adjacent to Italian Somaliland, the Italian occupation of Abyssinia appears to be effective only where there are Italian troops. But however that may be, it is unlikely that any Abyssinian will accept Amba Auraham as the Abuna with other than lip service. The tradition of loyalty to the Coptic Patriarch is an indurated tradition amounting to superstition among the Abyssinians and the hatred of Rome is a fanaticism not only because in its life of sixteen centuries the Abyssinian Church has always been a faithful daughter of the Church of Egypt but because of the cruelty which during their passing mastery of the country in centuries XVI and XVII the Jesuits employed to force the Abyssinians to uniatize and accept the Papacy. That Fascist Italy might attempt to force the Abyssinian Church to exchange its dependence upon the Coptic Patriarchate for dependence upon the Papacy was freely prophesied. For whatever else it be in theory, the Papacy is also Italian and in the circumstances the uniatization of the

Abyssinian Church could only be made effective by Italian missionaries of help, which would spell its Italianization. That the Vatican which, like the Bourbon, seems incapable of learning by experience and is Italianate at heart would succumb to the temptation seemed possible. But I thought that the Duce would have too much sense to risk the venture. If it succeeds and he does not regret his hazard, I shall be much surprised.

ARTICLES IN OUR PRESENT NUMBER.

The Bishop of Lincoln's paper on the Eucharist was received with great appreciation at the Edinburgh Conference and ordered to be printed in its Acta. It is reproduced in *The Christian East* in order to be in the hands of Orthodox readers. Incidentally Macmillan is reprinting the Bishop's *Fullness of Sacrifice* at 7/6. I know no book which I would more readily give an Orthodox student as a beginning to the study of the Anglican Communion.

Mr. Pierce is one of the Mirfield men who are studying at Czernautz University as Interchange Students of the Council on Foreign Relations. By the way, those students are given every religious privilege by economy and are undoubtedly not only profiting but serving as living books on the Anglican Communion to their fellow students.

THE ORTHODOX DECLARATION AT EDINBURGH

This Declaration was signed by the names of all the Orthodox delegates to the Edinburgh Conference and by Archbishop Germanos of Thyatira in the plenum of the Conference.

WE desire to make grateful acknowledgement of the fact that we have had every opportunity to give expression to our religious convictions in statements and discussions. But we ask pardon for saying quite frankly that sometimes, indeed often, the form in which the final statements of the Reports came to be cast was not congenial to us. Generalizing and the use of somewhat abstract language, does not appeal to the Orthodox mind.

We hold firmly that in religious discussions the truth is better served by making points of difference clear. When an agreement is achieved on such a basis its value is very great.

A careful study of the Reports which are now before the Conference will show that they express many fundamental agree-

ments which exist between us and our Christian brethren on many important points. On the other hand they contain a long series of statements in regard to which significant differences exist of such weight that we found it necessary to formulate the Orthodox standpoint upon them in a series of short footnotes. I now proceed to offer you our comments on the four Reports and to specify some of their most outstanding divergences from the Orthodox position.

In Report I (*The Grace of Jesus Christ*), fundamental agreement has been reached as to the meaning of Grace and as to its primary importance in the work of our salvation.

While being in agreement with this report on the whole, we desire to draw your attention to the term "co-operation" by which term the theology of the Fathers is accustomed to designate the active participation of man's will in the process of his sanctification. We wish that the Report had dealt with this term.

Report II (*The Church of Christ and the Word of God*) expresses a satisfactory agreement as to the inspired character of the Holy Scriptures, but with regard to the importance of tradition the Orthodox doctrine has been formulated according to what the Orthodox supported at Lausanne and elsewhere.

On the other hand there are most important points on which we cannot agree with Part II of this Report. We consider the Church and not the "Word" (i.e., the written and preached Word) as primary in the work of our salvation. It is by the Church that the Scriptures are given to us. They are God's gift to her; they are the means of grace which she uses in the work of our salvation. Further, we must point out with reference to the discussions about an "invisible" Church that the Orthodox Church believes that by its essential characteristic, the Church on earth is visible and that only one true Church can be visible and exist on earth.

In Report III (*Ministry and Sacraments*), the agreement achieved is much more limited than in the two former Reports. This will be evident from the great number of footnotes provided by Orthodox members of the Sections. Moreover, disagreement on points of capital and fundamental importance is very plain, for example upon the nature of the Sacred Ministry and of Holy Orders, upon the Apostolic Succession, upon the nature and the number of the Sacraments, upon the problem of validity and lastly upon some points touching the doctrine of Baptism and of the Eucharist, which are the only Sacraments that have received detailed consideration. It being impossible to enter into details here, we desire to emphasize the great importance which the Orthodox Church has from the very beginning attached to the Sacrament of Orders upon which, from the Orthodox point of view depends, of necessity, the valid rendering of all the other Sacraments, Baptism only being excepted. We would remind

you that this conception of the Orthodox Church is shared by all those who, calling themselves Catholics, insist on faithfulness to the doctrine and practice of the undivided Church.

"Passing to Report IV (*The Church's Unity in Life and Worship*), we desire to state here once more that we hold that intercommunion must be considered as the crowning act of a real and true Reunion which has already been fully achieved by fundamental agreement in the realm of Faith and Order and is not to be regarded as an instrument for Reunion. As to the other and extremely important subject of this Report, i.e., the Communion of the Saints, we recognize that in the discussion of the veneration of the Holy Virgin, the Theokotos, and of the saints a very valuable advance has been achieved. None the less essential differences remain and we Orthodox have felt obliged to mention our divergent points of view in separate footnotes.

We Orthodox delegates, faithful to the tradition of the ancient undivided Church of the seven Œcumenical Synods and of the first eight centuries, cherish the conviction that only the dogmatic teaching of the ancient Church as it is found in the Holy Scriptures, the Creed, the decisions of the Œcumenical Synods and the teaching of the Fathers and in the worship and in the whole life of the undivided Church, can form a solid basis for dealing successfully and rightly with the new problems of doctrine and theology which have arisen in recent times. We Orthodox delegates further stress the necessity of accuracy and concreteness in the formulation of the faith and are convinced that ambiguous expressions and comprehensive expressions of the faith are of no real value. We are opposed to vague and abstract terms which are used to identify conceptions and tenets that are really different from one another. We Orthodox therefore consider it our duty both to our Church and to our conscience, to declare in all sincerity and humility that while reports in which such vague and abstract language is used may perhaps contribute to the advancement of reunion between churches of the same essential characteristics, they are altogether profitless for the larger end for which they have been used, especially in regard to the Orthodox Church.

THE EUCHARIST SACRIFICE

81

THE EUCHARIST SACRIFICE.

BY THE RIGHT REVD. F. C. NUGENT HICKS, D.D., BISHOP OF
LINCOLN.

[*THIS memorandum was prepared during the Edinburgh Faith and Order Conference at the request of its Section that dealt with the Ministry and Sacraments and was presented by that Section to the plenum of the Conference which received it with great approval and ordered that it should be printed in the Report of the Conference.]*

A memorandum prepared by the Right Revd. the Bishop of Lincoln and commended by the Section to the consideration of the Conference.

1. The Eucharist, from its institution onwards, was connected with the idea of sacrifice. Our Lord used technical sacrificial language at least when He spoke of His "blood of the Covenant," "the Covenant in His blood." The language of different parts of the procedure of sacrifice is often used in the Epistles. He and His followers were Jews, brought up in the Jewish tradition. It is therefore to the Jewish system of sacrifice that we must turn to interpret this language.

2. The Church, in the liturgies and in the writings of the Fathers, continued the use of sacrificial language. The outline of pagan sacrifice was, at bottom, the same as that of the Jewish; and pagan sacrifice continued before the eyes of Christians as a working system until the Christianizing of the Empire destroyed the pagan worship. The Jewish sacrifices had ceased in A.D. 70. After the end of paganism there remained no visible system of outward sacrifice. In later centuries the Christian world ceased to be aware of it; and by the tenth century, when Eucharistic theology—soon to become controversy—began in the West, there was no technical knowledge available.

3. It was at that time that the Western world began to assume that sacrifice consisted almost solely in the death of the victim. There was the immemorial tradition that in some sense the Eucharist at least had to do with sacrifice: from some points of view *was* sacrifice. It was understood that our Lord's redeeming work was a sacrifice. That, so far, was New Testament teaching and, as tradition, historically true. But when the equation "sacrifice=death" had become established, the question came to be asked: "What is the sacrifice which the priest makes upon the altar?" or "What does the priest do when he offers Christ in the Mass?" The inevitable answer under the compulsion of the only existing theory of sacrifice was in the direction of the language of mystical

immolation. Christ was slain—however “mystically”—in each Mass.

4. There followed two consequences in the West, but not in the East:

- (a) As regards the sacrifice in the Eucharist, it became in some sense a repetition of Calvary. Christ's sacrifice had to be thought of simply as His death on the Cross. The representation of the sacrifice became in a sense a repetition, each time, of the death. Against this the protest of the Reformers was justified. The uniqueness of the Cross, the all-sufficiency of the One Sacrifice, was seen to be of the very essence of Redemption, and had to be vindicated at all costs, even at the cost of abandoning the age-long association of the sacrifice with the Eucharist. Hence the general movement of Reformed Western Christendom away from the language of sacrifice in connection with the Eucharist, the Holy Communion, the Lord's Supper, except where, as in the Church of England and in some other quarters, it was retained somehow in loyalty to the ancient tradition.
- (b) As regards the Presence in the Elements, if the Christ of the Mass was the Christ at the moment of death, His Body must be the Body as it suffered on the Cross, the Body of His humiliation; the Body in the state in which our bodies are in this life, the body not of the spirit but of the flesh. Whatever was the case with the theologians there was created the popular idea of the Presence as material and carnal; an atmosphere in which it was natural that there should be “miracles” of bleeding Hosts. Again, if this was what the Real Presence meant, the Reformers could not but, in greater or less degree, modify, explain it away or deny it.

It is surely from these consequences that the “Protestant” denial or mistrust both of the Sacrifice and of the Presence arose. It is doubtless true that it was from popular conceptions, not from the more refined official teaching, that the reaction came. It is only fair to say that St. Thomas Aquinas' treatment of “transubstantiation” was an honest attempt, in the philosophical language available to him, to spiritualize the doctrine of the Presence. But his teaching was not proof against popular superstitions and misunderstandings.

5. On the other hand the mediævalists or Western “Catholics” were right historically. Their belief in Sacrifice and Presence as part of the primitive tradition was justified. They had a real loyalty of their own, to which they had to try to be true.

6. It was only after the researches of the nineteenth century into the history of early religion and sacrifice, and in particular of Old Testament sacrifice, that the deadlock began to be removed.

We begin to recover what our Lord and the New Testament writers, and the Christians of the earliest centuries, meant when they used sacrificial language. The central fact is that the death of the victim was only one stage, and that an early stage, of the sacrifice as a whole. This began with the sinner's solemn approach with his victim: he "drew near," and this drawing near gives us the New Testament word "*corban*" for an offering. Next he pressed his hands upon the victim's head—a solemn identification of himself with it, meaning, inwardly and spiritually, that what happens to it in the rest of the action happens to himself. Thirdly, he himself kills the victim. He surrenders its blood, which is its life, now his blood, which is his own life, to God. The priest takes the surrendered life, symbolically, into the nearer presence of God (the horns of the altar or even the Holy of Holies); and God and man are made at one—"at-one-ment." Next, the substance of the victim, its slain body, representing the returned sinner himself, all that he is and has, is offered upon the altar of "burnt offering." It is accepted by God in the kindling upon it of the holy fire, His fire that has come down from Heaven, and it is burned. But the burning is not for destruction—the word for that sort of burning is not used. It is "*'Olah*," "that which goes up." It is transformed, etherealized, and rises in smoke to the heaven above, where God dwells: it is no longer gross and carnal and earthly, but spiritualized and accepted into the presence of God, as all earthly effort is when offered to Him, and He transforms it in accepting it. Lastly when, in the voluntary return to God, sin has been acknowledged, the rebel life has been surrendered and forgiven in the at-one-ment between God and man, and the carnal man has been transformed into spirit, in self-offering, God and man, and man and man, can become one in the meal on the flesh of the sacrifice.

This, and nothing less than this, is true sacrifice. There is no meaning in the Communion-meal, in the language of eating the Body and drinking the Blood, except as the last stage of sacrifice.

So Our Lord, our Victim, the Lamb of God, comes with us as we draw near. He makes Himself one with us in the Incarnation. We sinners kill our Victim; we crucify Him, the best of us hardly knowing what we do, prophesying only a little better than Caiaphas prophesied. He, our High Priest, takes His Blood, which is His Life—our blood, by the power of the Incarnation, and our membership of His Body, and therefore our life—through the veil, His broken flesh, into the very presence of God. He atones for us. His Manhood, in which our separate manhoods

are by degrees joined, is offered to God in eternal service, and as God accepts the offering by the fire of the Spirit, He transforms it. It was the Body of His humiliation, carnal and material, as ours are, mainly, still. It becomes, by His Resurrection and Ascension, wholly spiritual and heavenly. It is the same Body, of the Lamb as it had been slain, but glorified.

The motive of His eternal life, as it was, for Him, in His earthly life, is the inner motive of all true sacrifice: "Lo! I come to do Thy will, O God!" He still obeys, while He reigns at the Father's right hand, for He is still Man. But as the Christian Church grows, He no longer obeys alone. His obedience is His offering, and we obey in Him. As we offer Him we offer ourselves—our souls and bodies, with the offerings of the elements of bread and wine, and whatever other gifts we bring. They, like ourselves, are offered; offered and, in acceptance, transformed; and the Eternal Sacrifice, vindicated and secured by the all-availing Death, once died, is the whole God-ward movement of service, which is also worship, of worship, which is also service, towards the Throne.

That offering is what we join in, not in our worship only in the earthly sanctuary, but in the dedicated conduct of our daily life; and since our contribution to worship and to service alike is still imperfect, we can only offer it in union with the whole Body of which He is the Head. So we offer ourselves in Him, for His merits, and Him for ourselves. And in and through that offering we are received, at the earthly image of the heavenly Altar at which we make it, at what is also the earthly Table of the Lord, as children at our Father's Board, at home, already on earth, in our Father's eternal House.

So the Communion is not possible without the offering, the offering incomplete and purposeless without the Communion; and both are covered by the ever-renewed memorial and pleading of the Cross.

It follows, from this conception of the sacrifice of Christ, that (1) there can be no sort of repetition of His sacrifice in the Eucharist, no slaying of Him on the altar, no taking away from the uniqueness and all-sufficiency of the Cross; (2) there can be no idea of anything materialistic in the Presence. It is only "true" or "real" because it is spiritual: but spiritual not in a purely negative sense: for it is a "mystery" in which, by the power of the Spirit, earth and heaven, earthly things and heavenly things, are joined. The whole action, indeed, takes place in the realm of things spiritual: we are, in fact, lifted up to Heaven in the earthly worship. We are admitted to the scene of the Eternal worship of which we are given a picture in Rev. iv-vii. We are one with the angels and archangels and with all the company of heaven: with the whole communion of saints, on this side of the

veil and that, alike in our offering, our worship and the mutual interchange of prayer, and the fellowship of service.

Both the Reformers' difficulties therefore disappear.

Further, the Jews, by our Lord's time, had learnt the secret that thanksgiving, under all circumstances, even in adversity, is the secret of effectual prayer, for such thanksgiving means real faith in the praying. So our Lord prayed, before He broke the loaves at the feeding of the multitude, and before He broke the Bread and gave the Cup, at the Last Supper. He gave thanks (*eucharistésas*) or "blessed" (the Jewish equivalent of the idea expressed in Greek by Eucharist). Indeed, we may say with confidence that, if we want to know what His "consecration prayer" at the Last Supper was, it was the words that He used when he gave thanks; and what we call His "words of institution" are more correctly thought of as what we should call "words of administration." So also the "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" in the Old Testament is really a technical term for the peace-offering, the imperfect Old Testament foreshadowing of the Communion meal which is the last stage of sacrifice.

Lastly, the whole of true sacrifice is bound up, if with thanksgiving, so also with prayer. "He ever liveth to make intercession for us." As He reigns, He also pleads. And it is only in the power of His prayers, by the merit of His saving work, that our imperfect prayers have any value. So we testify when we end our ordinary prayers: "Through Jesus Christ our Lord." It follows that it is through His supreme, eternal prayer of thanksgiving and intercession, and self-offering, that, above all, our earthly prayers will avail. That is why it has been the age-long instinct of the Church that the Eucharist or the Lord's Supper is the supreme moment, or opportunity, for our prayers, of whatever kind, in union with His. It follows also that the whole action of the Eucharist, however we describe it, and above all what has traditionally been called the consecration, is an effective prayer. There can be no magic in it. We ask for God's greatest gift, Himself, and because our Lord is the celebrant of every earthly Eucharist, it is He who asks, and to the prevailing power of, and the fullness of the inevitable answer to, His thanksgiving prayer there can be no limit.

AN INTERVIEW WITH THE LOCUM TENENS OF SERBIAN PATRIARCHATE, THE METROPOLITAN DOSITEIOS.

(Translated from *Tserkovnaya Djizn.*)

FOR many months Orthodox circles in many countries have been following with intense interest the stubborn struggle of the Serbian Orthodox Church in defence of its interests, seriously threatened by the Government project of a concordat with the Vatican. Since the premature death of the inspirer of this struggle, the Patriarch Varnava, this interest has become even greater and now the eyes of all the Christian world are fastened on the two contending parties, the Government and the Church.

In connection with this correspondents were recently received by the Locum Tenens of the Patriarchal Throne of the Serbian Orthodox Church, His Holiness Dositeios, Metropolitan of Zagreb. This illustrious and beloved hierarch, now especially popular in Yugoslavia, in spite of his fatigue and the spiritual strain of guiding the ship of the Church through the waves of this tempestuous sea of passions and struggle, yet found time for a fatherly conversation with them and answered a number of questions of absorbing interest at the present moment.

The firm friend of Russia and of the Russians of the emigration in their trials, the Metropolitan Dositeios, when asked what was the attitude of the Church and the people to the rising tide of Catholic aggression in Yugoslavia, answered :

"The people will not under any circumstances betray the faith of their fathers, their Orthodoxy, which gave them enlightenment and made them a nation which has withstood the trials of centuries. Among the people there is not yet and there must not be a place for any kind of Catholic propaganda. Hence the right of a 'mission,' which the Catholic Church is trying to obtain by means of the concordat in Yugoslavia, is completely out of touch with the facts and cannot be put into operation."

"Your Holiness, which points of the concordat would appear to threaten most the peaceful ecclesiastical and political life of the Kingdom?"

"The appointment by Rome of the hierarchs of the Roman Catholic Church independently of the Government, the administrative and legal independence of the clergy—including even the military chaplains, rights in the schools and outside of them, financial advantages, the forcing of children of mixed marriages into becoming Roman Catholics, the suppression of living tongues from the services—won by a struggle of centuries, and much else which this disastrous project of a concordat gives to the Roman

Catholic Church in Yugoslavia. All these things make the Roman Catholic Church in effect the dominant Church in Yugoslavia, in spite of the fact that Roman Catholics comprise only 37% of the population of the country."

"And what is the attitude towards the concordat of your highest ecclesiastical authority now and of the Orthodox people after the death of the most Holy Patriarch Varnava?"

"To every ecclesiastically and religiously healthy man it is clear that to call such a project of a concordat normal is impossible; hence the struggle of the Serbian Church and people against such a project is natural and lawful. . . . The late Patriarch Varnava with a heavy heart bore on his shoulders this burden or, more properly, this protection of the rights of the Serbian Orthodox people, about whom his Government forgot. The late Patriarch in the work of his whole life showed his patriotism and love to the people. As head of the Serbian Orthodox Church and as spiritual leader of the people, it was his duty to point out to the Government and the people the danger of this unwary step to the Serbian Orthodox Church, with its centuries-old services to the people and its profoundly national spirit. This he did firmly but with his accustomed courtesy, but met with an insolent and curt rejection. To his argument reply was made by force. But force by itself can accomplish nothing but disturbance since the believing people is able and has been accustomed to protect its age-old sanctuaries and the chief among them—the Church of St. Sava. The death of the Patriarch has made orphans of the Church and the people. The loss they have sustained is shown by the unconsolated grief of the whole people. But this loss, calling forth a religious and national revival, has united the people round the Church. And the hierarchy now in full brotherly agreement can and must continue the work of the late blessed Patriarch, since there is no other way. Our enemies are spreading lying rumours that we are wavering—but this is a complete and evil-intentioned lie: the work of defending Orthodoxy will be carried out to the end. The struggle will be waged with all attempts on the Orthodox Church from whatever quarter they may come."

"Your Holiness, is there any foundation for the rumours that in the hierarchy there is not unanimity?"

"There is no schism of any kind in the hierarchy: our hierarchy will do its duty to the end. Neither the intrigues of Roman Catholics, nor those of anti-Serb elements, nor the bitter attacks of Godless Bolshevism, can reckon on success. The hierarchy, in union with the believing people, will protect their one treasure—the Orthodox Church. The sooner the Government grasps this, the sooner there will be internal peace in Yugoslavia, and towards this all must strive."

"What is the position now between the Church and the Government?"

"The conflict between the Government and the Orthodox Church is deeper than appears at first sight. At the basis of it lies the obstinate defence by the Government of the disastrous project of a concordat with the Vatican, unacceptable to the Orthodox Church and the Serbian people. This project has been considered by us from every point of view and very carefully and it is not necessary to stop to consider it now. The Serbian Orthodox Church in the interests of national unity gave up its privileges as dominant Church, which it enjoyed in the Kingdom of Serbia before the War and the union with the Croats and the Slovenes. It did not do this, however, in order that in relationship to it privileges might be given to militant Roman Catholicism. Our Church bases its case on the principle of the legal equality of religions in Yugoslavia, placed at the foundation of the Yugoslav Constitution, and quit this it cannot."

"Your Holiness, may we ask in conclusion what you think about the promises of the Government to give, after the introduction of the concordat, to the Orthodox Church the same privileges given to the Roman Catholics?"

"By means of the intentions expressed by the Government to give some sort of compensatory privileges to the Orthodox Church, the question is in no way settled, since the question is not about the privileges of the Orthodox Church but about its position and that of the other confessions, which is observed would have given no cause for interconfessional strife and the Orthodox Church would not have been compelled to defend its historic past and its present position."

"It must never be forgotten," added His Holiness the Metropolitan, "that Serbia has been, is, and will be an Orthodox land."

LIFE AND WORK IN THE CHURCH OF GREECE

BY THE GREAT ARCHIMANDRITE REVD. MICHAEL CONSTANTINIDES.

An Address at the Anniversary of A.E.C.A.

I WAS reading the other day an article on the Edinburgh Conference published in the last issue of the *Congregational Quarterly*. The author, besides making many other remarks quite unfavourable to the Orthodox Church, points out that, while the Archbishop of Thyatira Mgr. Germanos^o was reading, on behalf of all the Orthodox delegates, their well-known declaration dealing with the fundamental principles of the Orthodox doctrine, an

American was heard to remark: "The swan song of a dying Church." This reminds me of a book on the Lausanne Conference which was published some months after the Conference by an Anglican Canon, now a Bishop; he had examined the report of the Archbishop of Athens on the Church and had found it too conservative and rather unacceptable to Protestant-minded theologians; he also made some remarks, not very flattering, about the Orthodox Church generally. I must add, however, with all the frankness I am using when I have the privilege to speak to members of the Anglican Communion, that these are not the only people who hold rather erroneous ideas regarding the life and work of our Church. I know that there are many in this country who, admitting perhaps the Orthodox Church to have kept clear and undefiled the dogmatic teaching of the Ancient Church as formulated by the Œcumenical Councils of the first eight centuries, yet entertain the opinion that the Greek Orthodox Church of to-day, if it has not altogether lost its spiritual activity, is, nevertheless, unable to present to the world a life and work worthy of its glorious past and its great claim to be the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Orthodox Church.

I am therefore deeply thankful to the Committee of the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association for having asked me to speak to you this afternoon about the life and work of the Church of Greece. In order, however, to appreciate duly the present activities of the Church of Greece it is necessary to remember the following facts. First, that at the time when, here in England, the Evangelical Movement through its enthusiastic promoters, brought about a great revival in the Church of England and inspired it with new life and energy by insisting particularly on the dogma of the Atonement, Greece had not yet won her independence but was still a province of the Turkish Empire. Secondly, that when in 1833, Pusey, Newman, Keble, Froude, Williams, Palmer and Wilberforce, in the Common Room of Oriel College, laid the foundations of the Oxford Movement which has proved so beneficial for the whole of the Anglican Communion, Greece was only just being recognized as a free country by the Great Powers of Europe; moreover you may get some slight idea of the state of its Church at that period if you read what our great historian, the present Archbishop of Athens says about it in his book: "History of the Church of Greece." He says that, out of 22 Bishops who found themselves in Greece after the Revolution, and 30 refugee bishops, ten or twelve only had a certain amount of education. From the rest, those who had no education at all could only be distinguished from the other clergy by their practical training. As to the parish priests, Maourer says, at any rate not without exaggeration, that out of a thousand, nine hundred and ninety were not capable even

of putting down their own names. But we must not forget that most of those parish priests had taken an active part in the great Revolution and were bearing the stigmata of love to the faith of Christ and their enslaved nation. The first Sacerdotal School which had to furnish the Church with an educated clergy began its function in Athens in 1844. This was the Rizarios Ecclesiastical School which, up to the present day renders excellent services to the Church of Greece. I think it is quite necessary that one should bear in mind the facts I have mentioned in order that one may have a due appreciation of the life and work of the Church of Greece to-day. The task of the Church in the circumstances was almost terrifying, yet she did not lose heart but, mindful of her great responsibility for the religious and moral education of the Greek nation, she has surmounted all difficulty, and to-day a good work is going on among the masses of the people. There are about sixty Bishops in the Church of Greece to-day, all men of high theological training which they have received either at the Theological School of the University of Athens or at the Halki Theological School (Constantinople). Moreover, the ecclesiastical or sacerdotal schools established especially during the last 50 years, as well as the so-called preparatory ecclesiastical schools, which function at the centre of every diocese, give to the Church well trained parish priests who, under the leadership of their bishops, try to discharge their duties as faithfully as possible.

After these introductory remarks let me try to give you a short sketch of the life and work of the Church of Greece. And first as regards the work of preaching and teaching by word of mouth, the periodical religious Press and the catechetical schools. There are those in Western Europe who, judging very superficially the life of our Church, or looking at it through the glasses of prejudice, think and publicly declare that worship in the Orthodox Church has become a mere habit, something dead, without any inspiration at all, because they think we have neglected preaching, and cut away from worship the word of God. It is quite true, that we in the Orthodox Church believe with all our heart that the very centre and substance of worship is the Holy Eucharist; which for us is not a mere commemoration but the very extension of the Holy Sacrifice offered once for all on Calvary by our Blessed Lord. And to the Holy Sacrifice as the centre, all the hymns and prayers in the Holy Liturgy Converge. Notwithstanding this, however, the Orthodox Church has never thought that the preaching of the word of God can be left out of worship without considerable damage. On the contrary, we believe that preaching was and must be an inseparable part of worship. In the Church of Greece to-day every clergyman who is a theologian or graduate of an ecclesiastical seminary is bound by duty to preach the word of God when he

officiates. In the big cities of Greece, preaching to-day is carried on regularly and systematically. In the small towns and villages and in parishes whose priests are not equipped with a high or middle theological education, preaching is done by the Official Preachers who are a special institution in the Church of Greece. Every diocese has such an official preacher, proposed by the Diocesan Bishop and appointed by the Government. The Archbishopric of Athens has two. Their duty is to preach regularly in the parish churches not supplied with an incumbent of theological training; at the end of every year they must submit to the Holy Synod, through the Bishop of the Diocese, a detailed report of their activities. Moreover, lay theologians also, by special permission of the Diocesan Bishops, preach. The Brotherhood of Theologians "Zoe" alone, supplies the Church with about forty such lay-preachers who, having been educated at the University of Athens under the supervision of the authorities of the Brotherhood, and being trained in the art of preaching for many years at the Headquarters of the Brotherhood, render their most valuable services in the various Dioceses of Greece. Preaching has received a new impetus in the Church of Greece lately by the establishment of an institution known as the "Church Missionary Movement." This aims at spreading and strengthening preaching all over Greece, especially among the Army and Navy and Air Forces, and among the young. Besides the teaching by word of mouth, the Church tries to discharge this duty through the periodical, Ecclesiastic and Religious Press. There are about 30 such magazines throughout Greece, and two weekly ecclesiastical papers at Athens. The most widely spread of all these journals and papers is the periodical *Zoe* which has been established 27 years by the Founder of the "Zoe" Movement, the late Archimandrite Eusebius Matthopoulos; it is published weekly and has 75,000 subscribers belonging to every walk of life. It contains very carefully written, devotional and apologetic articles, a popular explanation of the Gospel and Epistle of every Sunday and a commentary on various events connected with the life and work of the Church among the community. Its aim generally is the aim of the Brotherhood itself, *i.e.*, the spiritual revival of the people so that they may be conscious members of the Orthodox Church.

The authorities of the Church of Greece have, in these last years shown a great interest in the youth of the country and its religious instruction. Many years ago, the religious education in the Government schools was very satisfactory. Both the teaching personnel as well as the time devoted to the religious lesson were suitable for the needs of the young people. The too liberal spirit, however, which held before and especially since the War, has influenced not only our politicians but also the teachers into whose

care the people entrusted the education of their children; the hours for religious instruction were curtailed and, what was worse, not a few of the teachers were influenced with Communistic ideas and ideals; one particular expression of their mentality being contempt for religion. Although the Church was not able at the time to undertake the task of the religious education of youth by herself, she thought it her duty to intervene actively. This she did both by energetic protests to the Government for an increase of the hours of religious teaching in the schools, and a better selection of the teaching personnel; and also by undertaking herself, through her clergy, the religious education of children in the catechetical schools. This was the beginning of the catechetical movement in Greece. The honour of the foundation of the first catechetical schools in Athens belongs to an enthusiastic parish priest, the Rev. Marks Tsaktariz who unfortunately died in 1923 at the climax of his great work. The Movement gradually spread from the capital to the provinces. To-day every Diocese has its catechetical schools which are attended by thousands of children. The Movement has been more systematized since the Brotherhood "Zoe" has taken an interest in it; they wrote text-books for the schools and since then, the whole work of Catechism has acquired a new impetus. According to the method adopted by "Zoe" the children have to attend first the preliminary or preparatory catechetical school and then proceed to the superior classes which are two; so the Greek young men who have gone through the whole course of catechetical lessons, not only know the fundamental truths of the Holy Orthodox Church, but are also equipped with a certain amount of practical apologetic knowledge which is so important to-day, when religion is attacked on every side by various subversive theories. You can have a very good idea of the catechetical activity of the Church of Greece to-day, if you consider that while in 1933 in Athens and the rest of the Dioceses of Greece 341 catechetical schools with 28,594 pupils were functioning, at the last scholastic year 1936-1937 the Brotherhood "Zoe" alone had under its control 311 schools with a total number of 37,094 pupils. In this connection I should like to put before you the following remarkable witness. In a pamphlet published in America and circulated all over the world by the "World Union of Catechetical Schools," the progress of Christian education in various countries in the year 1936 is indicated. It is shown that in Europe a remarkable conquest in the catechetical field took place in six countries, i.e., The Netherlands, Ireland, Finland, Greece, Czechoslovakia and Poland. With regard to Greece it is said: The Orthodox Church of Greece reports an increase of the catechetical schools of "Zoe" the number of pupils increasing from 9,333 to 41,800, while the total number of children in the catechetical schools of the whole country has reached the

number of 52,422. And if the last year Conference at Oslo—the pamphlet continues—had fixed a flag as a prize to be given to the city which has shown the greatest progress in catechetical activity, it would have been given to the ancient city of Athens.

I am more than sure that the American who remarked at the Edinburgh Conference that the Orthodox Church is a dying one, belongs neither to the publishers nor to the readers of the above-mentioned pamphlet which, as I have already said, has been published in America.

I should like now to say something about the "charities" work of the Church of Greece. In all the Dioceses to-day there are Charity Organizations controlled by the Bishop. These organizations are known under various names, *i.e.*, "Charitable Treasuries"—"Treasuries of Alms"—"Benevolent Funds"—"Poor Committees"—and are supported by special public collections by the monasteries, collections in the parish churches, legacies, donations, a percentage on the marriage licences, and by the private means of the bishops themselves. The revenues of these charitable organizations are used for the relief of the poor by either regular or extraordinary assistance; the release of those who are detained in prison on account of debts; endowment of either poor or orphan girls; the supplying of books, clothes and boots to destitute school-children or students, and assisting them to continue their studies; and for giving money, bread, meat and medical assistance to the poor, especially on the eve of the two great festivals of the Christian Year, *i.e.*, Christmas and Easter. Some of these organizations deal with tens, hundreds and even millions of drachmas. The general Charitable Treasury, that of the Archbishop of Athens, includes 145 parish charitable treasuries for the management of which 145 priests and an equal number of Churchwardens and 870 ladies, *viz.*, 1,160 persons are responsible. These parish treasuries of the Archbishop of Athens, Chrysostom, from 1926 till 1934 have spent for the poor 19,791,426 drachmas. Speaking in particular of the charity activities of the present Archbishop of Athens, Chrysostom, who, as is well known, is a voluminous writer, I must add that he has his own ecclesiastical orphanage, two hostels for the poor children of the refugee settlements with 170 inmates; and two hostels for girls with three preparatory and two professional schools. In the Orphanage situated at a distance of 30 miles from Athens 150 inmates are educated. When in 1924 Mr. Fernie, general director of the British "Save the Children Fund" in Greece, visited the Orphanage, he wrote to the Archbishop: " . . . one sees cleanliness everywhere, which is the most important factor in establishments of this kind. The boys are clean, disciplined, well-dressed and look very happy."

Some years ago the present Archbishop established surgeries

in Athens and Piræus where thousands of poor people find medical assistance free of charge. The last very important piece of work of the Church of Greece, is the great Hostel for Theological Students which is being erected in the yard of a monastery in the City of Athens. It will cost many millions of drachmas and will aim at the theological as well as the practical ecclesiastic training of the students, under the auspices of the Holy Synod of Greece and the supervision and guidance of the professors of the University of Athens.

The care of the Church for its Christians does not confine itself to their religious and moral needs only. In many dioceses the bishops, as presidents of educational societies or committees, using their authority as prelates of the Church, contribute toward the erection of school buildings costing sometimes millions of drachmas; they co-operate in every way with the Government in all educational needs; they grant from their own private means purses to pupils and students, and generally support every effort toward the betterment and spreading of the education of the people. Other social needs of the community receive the attention of the Church also. Some bishops, of their own initiative, establish libraries, musical academies and Byzantine museums in which valuable objects of our Byzantine civilization are collected and described, kept carefully and preserved. Other bishops supply their towns with grounds for the physical education of youth; centres of agricultural and industrial training; also textile and carpet factories. As an outstanding concrete example of the social activity of the Church of Greece to-day I would mention the re-building of the City and the whole province of Corinth which had been entirely destroyed by a great earthquake some years ago. This great achievement is due exclusively to the enthusiasm and untiring activity of the Bishop of Corinth, Mgr. Damascene.

I have tried to give you a rather general and brief sketch of the life and work of the Church of Greece. Lastly, I would point out that the most substantial, positive and systematic work is being done in our country to-day by the unique Brotherhood of Theologians "Zoe," the activities of which I have mentioned again and again in what I have already said. In a detailed article published in the last issue of *The Christian East* by Professor Bratsiotis the activities of the Brotherhood are sufficiently explained. This brotherhood, which is a great blessing to our country, was founded by the Archimandrite Eusebios Matthopoulos of blessed memory, 27 years ago. It is composed of 20 clergy and about 50 laymen, all of great spiritual power, full of humility and, at the same time, all inspired with sacred zeal for the salvation of their brethren. St. John Chrysostom says that one person full of a deep and sincere zeal can change a whole town. One can imagine

what a far-reaching spiritual work is being done by those seventy men, regenerated and inflamed with sacred zeal. We are deeply thankful to the Almighty for them, because, thanks to their systematic, intensive and ever-spreading activities, the life and work of the whole of the Church of Greece acquires new power and impetus toward the object of making the Greek people conscious members of the Church of Christ to the glory of the Almighty God.

HIGH FESTIVAL AT SIGHISOARA.

BY MARTIN PIERCE.

IF you look at a good map of Roumania, you will find a large larea caught in the crook of the Carpathians called Transylvania—a part which those who are old enough will remember as having been part of the Austria-Hungarian Empire before the War. And there, in the crook itself, is the small town of Sighisoara, or Schässburg, in its old Saxon name, one of the ancient seven fortresses which give the German name Siebenbürgen to this district. Indeed, at first sight, like many towns and villages in this part of Transylvania, it looks completely German in character. It is dominated by a great mound with steep sides, crowned with two Gothic churches (now Lutheran) and great mediæval walls and towers—the kind of tower that would look quite familiar in Germany. The main street, with its cobbled market-place, its tall flat-fronted houses with steep roofs and winking dormers, and the German names over its shops, add support to the feeling: and if you walk along the street you will quite likely hear more German spoken (in its local so-called *Saxon* dialect) than any other language. Yet it was Hungarian and not German domination that had kept the Roumanians at arm's length, so that they clustered like frightened sheep on the fringe of the town, with their little Orthodox church away outside its boundaries. And now the town belongs to them, and a great new Orthodox church stands proudly behind the old brown citadel, very new and very different from its more Western looking surroundings. Seen through our Gothic trained eyes, one is tempted to wonder if it would not have been more fitting to build something more in keeping with the old town, perhaps an enlarged and dignified development of the style of the little old Orthodox churches built in times of persecution, which achieve a quaint and pleasing compromise between Byzantine and Gothic. But to the Roumanian, the complete Byzantine style symbolizes the completeness of his change of status from slave to master, and

in any case the Church (or Cathedral, as they call any large town Church) is extremely beautiful. It stands in a park on the bank of the river in the midst of trees and with a wide space round it. The dome, the tall bell tower and the many-arched west porch are well proportioned; only the rather dull grey colour detracts from the beauty of the outside. Inside, its walls are fully frescoed, but not overpoweringly so. Here, modern feeling has brought an element of restraint into Byzantine interiors. The Iconostas is richly carved wood, but left in its natural colour instead of being gilded, the walls are not entirely covered with pictorial representations and there is room in between for formal design and plain washed surface. The paintings are for the most part a really successful interpretation of traditional severity and strength in modern terms. One is particularly striking which shows Our Lord with the children: perfectly natural, with children such as might be seen outside in the streets, and yet dignified and strong. In the dome, the austere figure of Our Lord dominates the whole building, and beneath it hangs a superb silver chandelier electrically lit. The electric sanctuary lamps, and, still more, the electric "candles" on the Holy Table, jar on our sense of fitness, and the representations of the Holy Trinity as the three angels which appeared to Abraham, over the door and on the Iconostas (the church is dedicated to the Holy Trinity) are childish and unpleasing to us. But apart from these things, the interior is a noble and successful artistic unity. The artist who painted it, A. Demian, has a well-deserved reputation in Roumania, and was, I am told, employed on the Roumanian Pavilion at the Paris Exhibition.

On the Saturday before the consecration of the Church, Sighisoară was *en fête* and gaily decorated with the attractive red, yellow and blue flag of Roumania. That evening Vecernie (Vespers) and Utrennie (an anticipated Matins) were sung in the little old church, with its wooden galleries built close up under the roof to accommodate the growing numbers, in the presence of the Most Reverend Nicolae Balan, Archbishop of Sibia and Metropolitan of Ardeal (Transylvania). Next morning at 8.0, the clergy all assembled in the new church to receive first a procession from the old church bringing a big flat painted crucifix encased in silver, four or five banners, and the Chivot—the model of the church which stands on the Holy Table and in which the Blessed Sacrament is reserved—carried on a wooden stretcher. Then soon after 8.30, all went to the door to receive the Archbishop and escort him to the Altar. Two rows of young men in Roumanian national costume lined the nave, and the procession was led by two small boys in white garments with a fringe of red round the bottom, carrying big unbleached candles. There were forty priests, eight of them Proto-popes, in the procession, all fully vested as for the

Liturgy, and making a wonderful pageantry of colour: for the East knows of no regular seasonal changes of colour, and they were all wearing their best vestments, red, green, gold, white or blue, over rich coloured silk or embroidered "albs."

When the Archbishop had vested, accompanied by the customary music sung at the "Strana" or music desk, the whole procession moved out through the West door again, and after a station at the top of the steps in full view of the vast crowd collected below, it went all round the Church to the accompaniment of a loud clashing of the bells, making four halts for the Archbishop to sing a passage from each Gospel in turn, and to paint a cross on the stonework of the Church. Then the Archbishop came to the door, now closed, and striking it firmly with his serpent-headed staff and with a small cross with which he blesses the people, cried out in a firm voice, "Open the door! Open the door, that the King of Glory may come in!" From the inside came the challenge, "Who is the King of Glory?" "The Lord strong and mighty, the Lord of Hosts, he is the King of Glory!" answered the Archbishop proudly, and then again "Open the door! Open the door that the King of Glory may come in!" The challenge and answer is repeated three times and then the door is opened and the procession enters with the Archbishop at its head. He blesses the inside of the Church with holy water sprinkled liberally in each direction with a bundle of some sweet herb, and then goes inside the *Altar*, as the whole area inside the Iconostas is called.

The next part of the ceremony is quite realistic and practical and a thing which one can hardly imagine being attempted in England. The Archbishop is girded in a white apron and white sleeves over his vestments, and, looking for all the world like a dignified and benevolent pastry-cook, takes a trowel and a bowl of cement and seals a roll in the altar-top by laying a stone in true workmanlike style. This roll contains a document recording the date of consecration, the name of the prelate who has performed the ceremony and the names of the priests assisting at it, and it was signed by the Archbishop when he first entered the Church. A wooden-top is then fitted over the altar, and this is vigorously washed by the priests standing round with soap and hot water which the Archbishop pours over it and rubbed dry with towels. The towels used at this point, and elsewhere for ablutions in Church are all large and exactly the same as are generally used in the house—though indeed they are much more attractive than our own, of smooth cloth with embroidered ends. Such ceremonies as these seem close to their practical origin; there is little of the merely symbolic about them, and while we could learn much from their lack of stiffness and formality, they often err on the side of untidiness and muddle. When the wooden top is dry, four paper

printed icons of the Four Evangelists are fixed to the four corners with drawing-pins hammered in with a hammer; and then the Archbishop paints crosses on the top and sides with a brush like a paint brush dipped in oil, saying a threefold Alleluia for each one. After this the robing of the Holy Table began. First, a white linen cloth was put right over it, hanging down all round, and tied with white tape round the base. Over this was laid a beautiful red velvet cloth with a gold edging, and then another white linen cloth. Lastly, the ornaments were placed in position: the *Chivot*, two crosses and the electric candles. Just then there was a rush to get the incense ready, and everyone fell over everyone else and gave each other contradictory orders for a minute or two. Only the Archbishop remained calm, and when eventually the censer was rushed forward and almost thrust into his hand, he turned and gave everyone a most delightful beaming smile, like an indulgent father with a lot of riotous children! He censed the Holy Table and everything on it, the Iconostas and the people. Then he knelt in front of the Iconostas with the priests around him, and all the people who could manage it (for the crowd was very great) knelt with him while he recited the long prayer for the actual consecration of the Church. It is only rarely that everyone kneels in a Roumanian Church, and when they do at such points as this, there is an intense concentration and rapt attention which is all the greater by contrast. After this, when similar crosses to those outside had been painted on the inside walls at various points, at the East end, the back of the Iconostas, the side walls and over the door, the Archbishop washed his hands, hung the towel round the deacon's neck, and with certain prayers said at the Royal Doors (the central ones of the Iconostas), such as normally end an office, the consecration proper came to an end.

There followed immediately the singing of the first Liturgy in the newly-consecrated Church, the Archbishop celebrating (or "serving the Liturgy" to use the Eastern expression) and all the priests concelebrating with him and receiving communion (in each kind separately) from his hands. A young man was made deacon in the course of it and shown to the great crowd to receive the approving shout of "*Vrednic este!*" ("He is worthy!"). The entire service and the Archbishop's address at the end (based on the text "I am the Light of the World" from the Gospel at the Liturgy) was relayed to the great crowds outside through loud-speakers fixed in the trees. The microphone was held by a young German in plus-fours who followed the Archbishop about with it, and looked rather out of place in his surroundings of Eastern ecclesiastical splendour! At the end of his address the Archbishop thanked everyone concerned in the building of the Church and in the arranging of the day's ceremonies with his own peculiar

graciousness of manner which takes away all sense of formality and makes each feel himself to be the recipient of a genuine, personal expression of gratitude.

When the procession left the Church (at about 12.30!) to open a fine new concrete bridge and to lay the foundation stone of a new school—both done with the blessing of the Church—the crowd surged out, and the police had their work cut out to direct them aright. Later there was a march-past of various religious societies from the surrounding districts with a wonderful display of national costumes, and then a huge banquet attended entirely by men, which lasted from 2.0 till after 5.0 p.m. with endless after-dinner speeches! In the evening a concert was given by a local society and some vocalists from elsewhere, and a dance which went on all night ended the festivities. At both these, national costume was the order of the day, and those who obeyed this order gave the gathering a delightful colourfulness and gaiety. Here one can see a holy day which is really a holiday, and a holiday whose whole *raison d'être* is a religious event. If one hears coupled with it more nationalism and narrow patriotism than is acceptable to English ears these days, and much that seems childish and bombastic, one must remember how recently these people have become part of a State they can call their own, and how recently they have gained the opportunity of educating themselves above the level of peasantry. And so Sighisoară has a new building which leaves one in no doubt that it is in a country which is now Orthodox by religion.

THE COPTIC ORTHODOX CHURCH.

BY THE EIGHOMANOUS (i.e. CANON) IBRAHIM LUKA.

THE Coptic Orthodox Church of Egypt was founded in the Name of Jesus during the first century and still bears her witness to the name of our Lord.

It is called the Coptic Church after its nationality, but is called Orthodox after its creed. The name "Orthodox" compound word (Ortho-doxa) which means "genuine principle." The Coptic Church has been given this title because it stood in defence of the old faith against the several attacks which were made upon it at various times. The Christians of Egypt, Sudan and Abyssinia follow the faith of the Coptic Church.

A SUMMARY OF HER HISTORY.

I.—CONCISE HISTORY.

The Coptic Church was founded in the year 45 A.D. by St. Mark the Evangelist who that year disembarked at Alexandria. He was providentially directed to a certain shoemaker named Anianos to whom he found an opportunity of preaching Christ's gospel.

The shoemaker was converted and baptized together with his family. This Anianos was the first fruit of the Christian faith in Egypt. Four years later St. Mark returned to Alexandria, made Anianos a Patriarch, and ordained three priests and seven deacons.

In 62 A.D. St. Mark died as a martyr. The Egyptian heathens arrested him as they were celebrating the memory of their god Serapis. Tying a rope around his neck they dragged him all day round the city and when night came he was cast into prison. Early in the morning he was taken out of the prison bound as he was, and dragged round the city in the procession of Serapis till he died. The believers took his body and buried it in the Church of Bucalia which was the first church founded in Egypt in a place called Bucalia situated on the sea-coast of Alexandria.

From that time onwards, the Coptic Church continued growing, extending like a fertile vine along the banks of the Nile, in spite of continuous attacks and severe persecutions.

It was near the end of the second century when the famous Clerical School, which was the source of philosophic and clerical instruction was founded in Alexandria.

Christianity still progressed in Egypt while idolatry was decaying to destruction. At the beginning of the fourth century the number of the heathens diminished till only a few remained. At the end of this century idolatry was overthrown and utterly destroyed for ever. His Beatitude Theophilus, the Patriarch, was granted a gift from the Emperor, which was the ruins of the old Temple of Bacchus—the god of wine—in Alexandria, in order to build a Coptic Church in its place. This action enraged the remaining heathens, who fought the Christians and killed many of the believers, fortifying themselves in this great temple under the leadership of Olympus. When the Emperor Theodosius heard of this, he ordered that all temples of idolatry should be destroyed. This caused the heathens great panic and terror so that they fled away leaving the temple of Serapis between the unsparing hands of destruction.

On the next day there was a great procession led by the Patriarch and the Governor followed by priests singing and praising God. Soldiers with their tools of destruction and the curious public joined the procession. In view of this procession the temple and

the idol erected therein were destroyed, and nothing was left but the outside walls which still remained after the place had been converted into the Coptic Patriarchate in Alexandria. This was the end of idolatry and the beginning of the prevalence of the faith of Jesus Christ throughout Egypt.

This state of affairs continued till the beginning of the 7th century. In the year 640 A.D. the Arabs invaded Egypt. From that time onwards Christianity was continually persecuted and, accordingly, it became weaker and weaker while the number of Christians decreased as time went on, partly because hundreds and thousands of them were killed, and partly because some—though they were few—were compelled to deny their faith in order that they might escape. But the Church, in spite of all this, still survived, and through our Lord's support, flourished and remained all these ages bearing witness to the beloved Saviour and preserving the true faith.

Various nations ruled over the Copts following the Mohammedan invasion, namely, the Ummayyad Dynasty 660, Abbaside Dynasty 743, the Ikhshids 884, the Fatimites 964, the Mameluks 970, the Ottomans 1422, and, finally, the British Empire from 1882 till 1922, when Egypt became an independent kingdom.

One hundred and thirteen Patriarchs have succeeded St. Mark as heads of the Coptic Church, the present Patriarch being Anba Youannes, the XIXth.

II.—SUMMARY OF THE FAITH AND ADMINISTRATION.

The essence of the Coptic faith is included in the creed drawn by the Synod of Nicea in accordance with the essential teaching of the Church. The faith of the Coptic Orthodox Church is characterized remarkable moderation, avoiding extremes in ordinances and traditions which might diminish the value and importance of the faith and spiritual facts, though at the same time it has not ignored the value of tradition and ecclesiastical rites. The Coptic Church observes its seven sacraments in conformity with defined ordinances full of spirituality and decency. They are accompanied with first-class artistic tunes for its hymns and songs. The Coptic Church has a standard canon-law embodying all the rules and regulations necessary for the administration of the Church. This canon-law is called *The Diskolia* after the Greek word *Dissskalia* which means "Instructions."

In accordance with this canon-law the Church is divided into parishes headed by Bishops who are supervised by a religious assembly called the Synod, the Chairman of which is the Patriarch. This Synod, according to the law, should meet twice

a year and it is the sole authority which can try Bishops and decide and change ecclesiastical rules. It is also the Body of Appeal for the clergy who are condemned by their Bishops.

The Constitution of the Church is clear as to the appointment of all the clergy, deacons, priests, bishops or Patriarchs. They should be, according to canon-law, good, pious, educated, able to preach and capable of administration. The Constitution provides for the suspension or even excommunication of any who may prove to be inefficient, careless or morally imperfect.

The Constitution of the Church is a model of democracy protecting both clergy and laity. As an example of this democratic attitude, it is to be noted that any ordination carried out without the full approval of the congregation is considered illegal and null.

III.—THE PERSECUTION OF THE COPTIC CHURCH.

The history of the Coptic Church is full of fearful and perpetual persecution, in spite of which she has remained steadfast and kept her faith intact through the overruling hand of our Lord. One well-known writer has said: "The upkeep of the Christian faith in Egypt must be considered as an additional wonder to the seven wonders of the world."

A short account of the persecutions is mentioned here in order to give an idea of what the Church has suffered through the past ages.

In the year 235 the Emperor Decius tortured many of the believers. An incident described by Dyonisius tells of six men (including a young man called Dioscorus) and four women who died in a horrible manner. They were first whipped and then thrown into a blazing fire on account of their Christian faith. Dioscorus only was given a chance to think over his peril before being condemned, that in case he changed his mind and abandoned his faith he might be relieved. But Dioscorus stood firm and bravely awaited his terrible end.

Later, the Emperor Valerian urged the heathens to torture and destroy the Christians. The heathens commenced with an aged man called Mitri who refused to deny his Lord's Name. He was beaten, wounded with spears and thrown outside the city where he was stoned till he succumbed to his wounds. The heathens attacked, robbed, burnt and killed many of the Christians at that time.

Persecutions continued almost unceasingly, and before the third century was over, Diocletian pulled down the churches, burnt Holy Scriptures, dismissed Christians from Government service, deprived them of their national rights and allowed the unbelievers to persecute and torture them. One of the historians described what was going on at that period as follows: "The heathens

skinned the martyrs and left them to die. Women were lifted up naked by a special machine, while others were tied up between two separate branches of a tree, which branches were then allowed to go back to their natural position thus severing the chest from the arms."

This is a little account of what actually took place in the course of many years when the Christians stood firm and their faith was never shaken. On the contrary, whenever one was tried his neighbours and companions voluntarily joined him to meet their fate. In this way thousands perished, among whom were the famous martyrs St. George, St. Barsoum el Eryan, St. Mina and St. Dimiana, and in memory of this persecution the Coptic Church commenced the well-known calendar known as "The Martyrs' Calendar."

Mrs. Butcher, the historian, in describing the above persecution, said: "Now the ten years of agony and horrible torture of Christians have ended but no other Christian Church in the world did ever suffer as much. Every Christian nation in the world may give painful incidents of persecution, but since Christianity commenced, none ever heard or dreamt of such an unimaginable torture and horror like that inflicted on the Copts at that period."

A detailed account of the tribulations that followed in the various centuries cannot be given in this short paper especially those which occurred in the Middle Ages during the reign of Ahmed Ibn Toulon and El Hakim bi Amr Allah and their followers. Sufficient to say that out of thirty million Copts existing in the seventh century during the early days of the Mohammedan invasion, there only remained two thousand during the reign of Mohammed Ali Pasha and nearly a million and a quarter to-day.

IV.—THE COPTIC CHURCH DEFENDING THE CHRISTIAN FAITH.

The Coptic Church did not only go through persecutions but also was tried several times by strange doctrines, but it went through both without blame. In relation to this, Mrs. Butcher says: "The Egyptian Coptic Church has kept her old traditions, laws and rites more than any other church."

Of all heroes of faith may be mentioned the great Athanasius and Dioscorus who spent their whole lifetime in continual struggle to defend the Orthodox faith. Many cruel sufferings have they met with, but they stood firm almost against the whole world. Athanasius was rightly called "The Defender of Faith."

V.—THE COPTIC CHURCH TO-DAY.

The Coptic Church at present is just like a patient going through the convalescent stage after a long course of illness, i.e., the ages

of her persecution, and is commencing slowly to regain her former state of power and service.

Reform is being attempted in various directions. Steps are being taken to elevate the standard of the clergy, to ordain none but the educated, to form various societies in cities and villages for preaching and instruction, as well as schools and institutes for the poor.

A great attempt is being made to strengthen the spiritual life and uplift the morals of students. The "Friends of the Bible" which runs on the same lines as the "Student Christian Movement" is carrying on great activities in this field both through her central headquarters in Cairo and her branches throughout all Egypt.

Sunday Schools are growing in size and new ones are being opened in different cities, all co-operating with the Cairo main centre.

The Church to-day beholds many active societies here and there, endeavouring to raise up their Mother Church to her former glorious position of zeal and service. Success is being achieved in many quarters.

VI.—THE COPTIC CHURCH AND OTHER CHURCHES.

The Coptic Church wishes always to be on the best of terms, of peace and love, with other churches, and opportunity is taken here to express heart gratitude to those who have shown a true feeling of brotherhood. It is with some degree of pain that the policy of proselytizing adopted by some churches is referred to here. St. Paul writes: "So have I strived to preach the Gospel not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation." We sincerely hope that all churches will remember that Apostolic principle when working in other lands, and that they all remember at the same time that Christianity, as one unit, does not gain by making a split in any of the Christian Churches.

It will give us great pleasure if the time comes when all churches will show mutual respect and love, so that we may all join in one spirit for the glory of the One Lord Jesus Christ, and for the welfare and prosperity of the Church as being the one body of our Lord and Saviour.

TEACHING OF THE COPTIC ORTHODOX CHURCH ON THE DIVINE TRUTH.

BY THE REV. EIGHOMANOUS I. LUKA.

INTRODUCTION

It is incumbent on every zealot for the truth and the Church to unveil the fallacy in the Church's creed and to proclaim the true

attitude of the Church towards the teaching of the Divine Word.

We deal with this serious question, not merely for the sake of defending the Church to which we belong and taking sides with her, but we are forced to write primarily by the cause of loyalty to God's truth.

We declare also that we are not tempted to write by fanaticism against other churches or a yearning for foolish controversies but merely to make known the right attitude of the Coptic Orthodox Church.

May God grant wisdom to both writer and reader in order that the dealing with this subject may be sanctified for the service of the truth and will of the Lord Jesus who is the Way, the Truth and the Life.

This discussion may be divided into three parts:

- (1) The distinctive position of the Orthodox Coptic Church with reference to the conformity of her teachings with the Divine truth.
- (2) The fundamental principle of this distinction.
- (3) Witness of history for this distinctive position.

I.—THE DISTINCTIVE POSITION OF THE COPTIC ORTHODOX CHURCH WITH REFERENCE TO THE CONFORMITY OF HER TEACHING WITH THE DIVINE TRUTH.

Every unprejudiced person who meditates on the Teachings of the Orthodox Coptic Church and the other churches which differ from her, from the standpoint of their conformity with the divine truth, cannot but admit that the Coptic Church is distinguished from other contradicting churches by the fact that her teachings are marked by the loyal hallowing of the revelation of the divine inspiration and the maintenance of same.

We do not claim this right in vain, but we affirm a fact supported by many proofs as follows:

Every teaching declared by the Coptic Church rests on a clear statement in Holy Writ, while contradicting churches fail to support their teaching by the divine word. Let us, therefore, review those doctrines which are the subject of difference between her and other churches.

(a) *Procedure of the Holy Spirit.*

The Coptic Church teaches that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father. She supports this teaching by a plain saying of the Master in Jn. 15: 26, when He says "which proceedeth from the Father" and not from the Father and the Son. If we go through

the whole Bible from beginning to end, we cannot trace a plain text in support of this latter doctrine.

(b) *Descent of Christ from the Cross to Hell.*

The Coptic Church teaches the descent of Christ to hell (hades) after his death. She supports her teaching by many references: Ps. 16: 10, Acts 2: 25-31, Rom. 8: 6 and 7, Eph. 4: 9, 1 Pet. 3: 18 and 19, and 1 Pet. 4: 6.

Other churches hold that Christ never descended to hell, but cannot produce one plain text denying His descent to hell.

(c) *Predestination.*

The Church teaches that God predestinated the elect to eternal life in accordance with His foreknowledge. She proves this teaching by explicit sayings: Rom. 8: 29, 1 Pet. 1: 2. Other churches differing from her say that those persons whom He elected for life, He elected by His mere grace without foreseeing in them any faith or works or anything else that may justify His moving towards them. When we search the whole Scriptures we fail to find an explicit text in support of this teaching as is the case in the teaching of the Coptic Church.

(d) *Faith and Works.*

The Coptic Church teaches that both faith and works are necessary for salvation. Besides the abundant references which confirm the relation of good works to eternal life, which we will mention later on, she offers a clear text bearing on the significance of good works in salvation: James 2: 14. This is a plain text which tells of the necessity of the working together of good works and faith in salvation. The Church which contradicts this view says that the purpose of sanctification, which means good conduct, is to prepare us to glorify God in our bodies and spirits while we are in this world, but has nothing to do with the salvation of the soul which will be obtained free by mere faith in Christ. Our worthiness to heaven depends on the blood of Jesus Christ alone and on more of the fruits of the Holy Spirit in us. When holders of this doctrine are asked to give a text in evidence of this teaching they fail.

(e) *Tradition.*

The Orthodox Church teaches the holding fast to tradition. She supports this teaching by the Apostolic exhortation in 2 Tim. 8: 15. Other Churches deny this teaching and when asked to produce a text forbidding the holding of tradition they find no outlet but through resorting to texts which refer to Jewish tradition and are not connected with Christian traditions.

(f) *Existence of Sacraments in the Church.*

The Coptic Church teaches that there are sacraments in the Church for obtaining invisible inner grace through visible outward

signs. Besides the many references in the Scriptures proving the existence of sacraments and the achievement of grace through them we find a clear Apostolic text in 1 Cor. 4: 1. One of the churches denies this teaching but is unable to quote one text disputing the existence of sacraments.

(g) *The Necessity of Sacraments for Salvation.*

The Coptic Church teaches that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are necessary for salvation and supports the teaching with many proofs, offering clear texts in evidence of it. Matt. 16: 16, Jn. 3: 5, Acts 2: 38, Jn. 6: 53. Differing churches say that sacraments are not necessary for salvation but unfortunately cannot support their statement by any text.

(h) *Baptism and its Connection with Salvation.*

The Coptic Church teaches that Baptism saves. It can readily produce a proof of her doctrine since it is written: "Which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a-preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. The like figure, even baptism, doth also now save you, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God by the resurrection of Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. 3: 19-20).

Other churches say that baptism does not save and when asked for a clear written proof in favour of their teaching we find that their proof is poor and that the Bible with all its contents includes no statement whatever that Baptism does not save.

(i) *The Sacrament of Confirmation.*

The Coptic Church teaches the existence of the sacrament of confirmation whereby the gifts of the Holy Spirit are obtained. The Bible confirms this Sacrament and declares its object. See Acts 5: 14, 15 and 17. Other churches deny this Sacrament but offer no clear evidence of its non-existence.

(j) *The Sacrament of the Eucharist.*

The Coptic Church teaches that what we eat in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is the body of Christ Himself and what we drink is the blood itself; and when asked to give a proof of the authenticity of this teaching we declare that Christ said plainly: "Take, eat; this is my body. . . . Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

Differing churches say that the bread and wine are symbols of Christ's real body and blood, but they fail entirely to produce a text which says: "Take, eat, this bread which is a sign and a symbol of my body. Drink ye all of it, for this is a sign and a

symbol of my blood," whereas the Coptic Church offers a clear text in favour of her teaching.

(k) *The Authority of Absolution in the Sacrament of Repentance.*

The Coptic Church teaches that God committed to his Church authority to declare remission of sins to repenting sinners in order to soothe their consciences. She offers in support of this teaching plain texts, especially the Master's commendation to His disciples in Jn. 20: 22-23.

Other churches deny this teaching saying that ministers have no authority to pronounce remission of sins to penitents, but fail to offer a text illustrating their denial.

(l) *Anointing the sick.*

The Coptic Church teaches the existence of the sacrament of anointing the sick to cure them of their spiritual and bodily sickness. When asked to give a proof of the authenticity of this teaching she refers to St. James 5: 14-15.

Differing churches teach that there is no place for this holy rite, but fail altogether to produce a text showing that anointing the sick with oil is a superstitious teaching which the Church should avoid.

(m) *Priesthood.*

The Coptic Church teaches that those who should administer the sacraments in it are those lawfully ordained by the laying on of hands and by prayer. She proves her teaching by numerous evidences of which few will be quoted here.

As regards the ordination of priests for the ministry it is said in Acts that after Paul and Barnabas had founded the churches in several places they returned to them confirming the souls of the disciples. They ordained them elders in every church. Acts 14: 23. Also in St. Paul's epistle to his disciple, Titus 1: 5.

As regards the gift which accompanies the laying on of hands in the ordination of ministers, suffice it to refer to St. Paul's exhortation to his disciple Timothy. (2 Tim. 1: 9.)

Contradicting churches teach that no gift is given by the laying on of hands, and that hands are laid on simply as an outward sign of separation for the ministry. Others say that the administration of sacraments does not necessitate the ordination of special ministers. Both groups fail completely to prove their teaching from the Bible.

Enough has been said so far to prove that the teaching of the Coptic Church is founded on plain texts which confirm her doctrines, a ground which other churches lack.

But we may add that the Coptic Church need not introduce any additions to nor omissions from those passages to support her teachings as other churches do.

In the case of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, for instance, these churches are obliged to add to the words which Christ spoke, two more words "sign and symbol" in order to express what they believe. The Spirit says: "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you" (Deut. 4: 2). He threatens those who add or omit by plagues and woes.

II.—THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE OF THIS DISTINCTION.

Contrary to other churches, the Coptic Church does not promulgate any teaching in connection with the fundamental facts of faith which may be contradicted by plain teachings from the Bible. We have already given a summary of the main doctrines which are points of difference between her and the other churches. If we examine these doctrines we cannot find a plain passage in the Bible which contradicts any of them or calls the Church to refrain from upholding it. For example we do not find a text that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Father nor that Christ did not descend to hell and so on as regards all the rest of the disputed doctrines. But we, on our part, can point out to the differing churches clear texts which deny their views. For instance, in the case of their denial of Christ's descent into hell, the Bible records many sayings contrary to their teaching and does proclaim the descent of Christ to hell as already seen. Likewise in the case of predestination, while they deny its being founded on foreknowledge, we can produce clear texts showing that predestination is based on foreknowledge, which fact contradicts their teaching as also do the plain texts expressing God's desire that all men be saved. (Tim. 2: 4 and 2 Pet. 3: 9.) In like manner we find explicit passages contradicting the rest of their teaching which differs from us; as is evident from the foregoing paragraphs. Consequently, we do not pronounce a wrong verdict when we say that the Coptic Church occupies a distinctive position among other churches in as much as conformity with God's word is concerned.

(3) Throughout her teaching, the Coptic Church does not ignore any teaching declared by the Divine Word, which is not the case in other churches which differ from her. The Bible teaches predestination and the Coptic Church confirms predestination. The Bible teaches that predestination is founded on foreknowledge and the Church sets forth this teaching. The Bible says that faith is necessary for salvation and is its foundation and the Church maintains this teaching. The Bible speaks plainly about the necessity of good works in preparation for eternal life and she teaches that as well. The Bible urges the faithful to call, when they are ill, the clergy of the Church to pray for them and anoint

them with oil in the name of the Lord and she consecrates this rite which she holds as one of her seven sacraments.

As to other churches, how evident it is that they uphold certain passages in the Bible and ignore others! They teach predestination and ignore the teaching concerning foreknowledge. They teach the necessity of faith but overlook the many references which tell about good works and good conduct. Those churches which teach the existence of sacraments, ignore the teaching connected with their relation to salvation and the achievement of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. They hallow some of the rites of Church and neglect the others about which clear texts exist. The Presbyterian Church, for example, neglects the sacrament of confirmation by the laying on of hands on the baptized, despite the evidence for it in the Bible. She also neglects the sacrament of anointing the sick though the command in God's word about it is beyond doubt. To this same default is attributed the conspicuous deficiency in the Church of the Brethren caused by ignoring the ordination of ministers for the administration of the sacraments and rites of the Church.

This attitude, which does not become the Church of God, has long been a source of temptation to those who defend the doctrines of those churches as they are led to omit part of the texts when quoting them. For instance, in the text "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" (Rom. 8: 1), they recite the first part of it and ignore the latter. Likewise Christ's words "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Matt. 16: 16), they abbreviate it thus "He that believeth shall be saved." They do that in order to avoid awakening people's minds to the doctrines and teachings which they ignore.

(4) The teaching of the Coptic Church is free from such dangerous element, which may do harm to weak souls or cause them to stumble, thus losing their salvation, for which Christ shed His precious blood. How abundant are these teachings in the other churches.

The most important points in which the difference between the Coptic Church and other churches appears are:

Predestination. The teaching of the Coptic Church about predestination embodies the sense of God's grace and favour in appointing us to salvation from the beginning, not for any works of righteousness which we do, but according to His mercy and His foreknowledge of our readiness to respond to His call; and the sense of personal responsibility which refreshes the soul and stimulates it by the belief in God's desire for the salvation of all, which fact preserves hope when faith is put to the test.

The teaching of differing churches leads some to sloth and

laziness and others to failure and despair, which fact those churches admit (see article 17 of the Common Prayer Book and the Confession of Faith, p. 48). Both dangers are an open abyss whereinto souls are entrapped to eternal destruction.

Faith and Works. The teaching of the Coptic Church with regard to the necessity of faith and works preserves faith's central place in salvation, and also preserves the prominent place of good works amongst the qualifications for the inheritance of eternal life. It calls the soul to depend on her faith in her Lord and Redeemer and in the meantime stirs it to be always diligent, adding virtue to faith to make its calling and election sure. 2 Pet. 1 : 5-11. But the teaching, particularly of the Plymouth Brethren, in this connection, is dangerous because it draws the weak, whom we should protect and take care not to cause their souls to stumble in slackness and indifference, thus causing them to stumble and fall. It rather exposes them to the dangers of the old doctrine of the Nicholaitans. Rev. 2 : 15. We may trace the sense of this danger in their writings though they disown the existence of this danger in their teaching and use arguments in which they strive to deny the occurrence of this danger.

Teaching about the Sacraments. On her teaching about the sacraments, the Coptic Church has preserved the place of faith as the basis for obtaining every gift and talent. It has also preserved the place of prayer and the Word as the basis of sanctifying all means for obtaining God's free grace. At the same time it has preserved for the faithful the assistance given by God through His love for them and help in confirming their faith to obtain tangible visible things. "What eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him."

As regards the teaching of other churches, whether those who deny altogether the existence of sacraments or who deny their practical action, they deprive the faithful of those sources of support, and make them lose the help which God provided them with in order to realize with hearts void of doubts the blessings which God prepared for their souls and bodies. We do find the effects of this danger apparent now in the Church. Although we are far more advanced in knowledge than the past generation was, yet we notice with painful hearts that the fruit of real Christian life is much weaker than before. It is certain that the most important cause of this spiritual retreat is the present weak apprehension of the sacraments on the part of Christians and the disappearance of the first confidence in their hearts with regard to its sure action in their souls. This weakness found its way to them only through the spread of teaching of those churches which deny the importance of the sacraments. Consequently there lies a danger in this denial proved by experience.

Teaching about Falling. How great is the difference between what the Coptic Church teaches in connection with hope in repentance and restoration, which encourages sinners to return to their Heavenly Father and the realization of the promise of salvation in Him, and what the Church of the Holy Movement teaches about falling, which leads the weak to despair and distress and giving themselves up to weakness and the life of isolation from God.

Papal Supremacy and its Infallibility. The danger of the teaching of the Roman Church is evident. It turns the eye of the faithful—from the hope of salvation in the Lord Jesus as the only head of the Church to a human head, thus exposing the Church to falling in serious mistakes and leads it to places of stumbling and sin. The Coptic Church prides herself over the fact that she was the first Church which fought valiantly against this dangerous teaching.

Ways of human atonement. This is also an error of the Roman Church. A stupendous error which involved contempt to the blood of Christ. It involved the substitution of the innocent blood by means of atonement made by men, rendering money the way to heaven instead of committing the heart to God and living in loyalty to Him—a fact which corrupted the life of many and encouraged them to lead a life of sin and corruption.

(5) The Coptic Church does not refute in her teachings any facts of faith. In other differing churches we often find teachings contradicting the essential facts of Christian faith. For instance, in the doctrine of election, the teaching of the Coptic Church conforms in all respects with what the Christian faith teaches about the perfect qualities of God, especially His justice, mercy, will that all men be saved, 1 Tim. 2 : 4, and 2 Pet. 3 : 9, His purpose in the redemption wrought by Christ which is mercy to all, Rom. 11 : 32, and the sufficiency of His atonement for the salvation of all humanity, 1 Jn. 2 : 2. Whereas the teaching of other differing churches about fore-election contradicts the teaching of the Christian faith about God's perfect mercy and absolute justice. It also limits the will of God for the salvation of humanity as well as His purpose in Christ's redemption within narrow bounds, and blemishes the sufficiency of the divine atonement—a fact which does not seem to satisfy the enlightened consciences and hearts full of zeal for the glory of God.

Also in the doctrine of the oneness of Christ's nature, the teaching of the Coptic Church falls into line with the doctrines of Christian faith re the value of Christ's sacrifice and its suffering for salvation as a divine sacrifice. But the teaching of the other churches setting apart the suffering and pains to human nature and rejecting the attribution of them to the divine nature leads

naturally to the denial of the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice for the purpose for which He offered Himself, because it renders it a human sacrifice which places it in complete contradiction to a preliminary fact in the Christian faith.

On account of this doctrine the Coptic Church stands particularly unique among other churches in loyalty to the divine truth in her teachings, being the one Church that upheld the true teaching on this doctrine, for which cause she, armed with the power of the Lord of Hosts, resists beings and rulers and suffered the enmity of both the Eastern and Western Churches.

(6) The teachings of the Coptic Church are safe from the point of view of going to extremes which other churches fall into.

He who ponders a number of the doctrines differed upon between Catholics and Protestants observes that personal motives and purposes played a prominent part in defining those doctrines, wherein appears moderation on the part of the Coptic Church and extremity on the part of the Western Church.

Teaching about Faith and Works. The Roman Church magnified personal works to such an extent that she rendered heaven confined to supererogatory self-righteous works. On the other hand the Protestant Churches went over to the other extreme to the extent that one of them denounces every relation of worthiness for heaven to good conduct which is the fruit of the Spirit.

The Coptic Church took a moderate stand preserving for each of faith and works its own place in salvation.

TRADITION.

The Catholic Church continued sanctioning her consecutive traditions which led her to adopt, in many of her affairs, a policy which opposes the clear passages of the Bible. The Protestant Churches then originated and pulled down the construction of tradition from its foundation denying its authority and making no distinction between true and false tradition. But the Coptic Church took a moderate stand holding the divine inspiration as her light and guide and paying her respects to authoritative tradition.

ECCLESIASTIC AUTHORITY.

The Roman Church exaggerated the Papal supremacy and placed the souls of her people under the absolute authority of the clergy. They may send souls to heaven or to hell as it pleases them. The Protestant Church went, on her part, to extremes and denied that authority. But the Coptic Church took a moderate stand and ratified that authority but under certain conditions and terms the nature of which leaves no room for its despotic use.

Likewise she rendered it futile for any one to indulge in it or employ it without right. She condemns any bishop who dares to use excommunication unjustly, for humiliating his people, or for taking revenge. He will himself become excommunicated by God and the inflicted blow which he pronounces is reacted on him. She orders that such be deposed of his charge.

ANointing the Sick.

The Roman Church went beyond the significance of the divine word on this sacrament. She turned it to a sort of licence for the seriously ill whereby they enjoy the next world. She thus ascribed to it a quality not related to it and attributed to it work not declared by divine inspiration. She limited its administration to the hopelessly ill contradicting the clear command of St. James. The Protestant Church neglected the administration of this rite which the Apostle clearly endorsed. The Coptic Church stood in the middle of the two and preserved the practice of this holy sacrament and its ultimate end in accordance with the teaching of God's word.

FORGIVENESS IN THE NEXT WORLD.

The Roman Church fell into a deep abyss of error in connection with this doctrine. She invented a purgatory not mentioned in the Bible. On the basis of this doctrine she opened wide doors for atonement consequently encouraging weak souls to lead lives of sin and iniquity. On the other extremity stood the Protestant Church which denied altogether the teaching about forgiveness in the next world contradicting a clear statement in the Bible. Matt. 12: 32. The Coptic Church took a wise and moderate attitude combined with loyalty to God's word. She neither denied a fact which the Master affirmed, nor did she exaggerate the belief in forgiveness in the next world. She endorsed it, and on account of it, she prays for the departed true believers whose salvation is sure, having passed in readiness to eternity. She does not ask their forgiveness except for what they committed when they were yet in the world in the way of sloth or carelessness in their fight for the glory of their Redeemer. The purpose of asking for this forgiveness is that God may grant them rest from the suffering of the soul in remembering any slackness or neglect on their part in their earthly journey. In short, she teaches, in this connection, a rest for the souls of the saved not a salvation for the unsaved.

Here ends the study of the six facts wherein appears the significant attitude of the Coptic Church in her loyalty to the teachings of the divine truth. Every unprejudiced enquirer finds in them a sufficient proof of the truth of this claim.

THE FUNDAMENTAL BASIS OF THIS DISTINCTION.

The fundamental principle which characterizes the Coptic Church and distinguishes her among other churches is the founding of her teachings on passages of the Holy Scriptures collected together and not isolated, a feature which other churches lack.

One of the preliminary facts of theology is that the Holy Scriptures explain one another, and that its separated parts are related to one another in such a way that serious danger ensues if any teaching is expounded otherwise or if no notice is taken of this preliminary theory, namely, the unity of the Holy Scripture and the bearing of its contents to one another.

For example, if we take a text like St. Peter's "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons. But in every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him," Acts 10: 34 and 35, as an independent text and disregard other sayings in the Holy Scriptures which reveal the Apostle's particular aim in this saying, we are apt to infer that faith in Christ is not essential for salvation, because in every nation, believing or not believing in Christ, there are people who fear Him and work righteousness acceptable with Him. In other words, preaching Christ is vain for we preach Him crucified and declare that faith is the sole way to salvation.

Also, if we take Solomon's saying about bodily equality of man and animal, "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth," Ecc. 3: 21, as an independent statement, we may conclude from it a sense of atheism or at least scepticism as to the ultimate end of man's immortal soul.

The Coptic Church kept aloof from this dangerous method but unfortunately we find other churches commit themselves to it, and we tell no lies if we say that the Coptic Church was preserved from the straying which other churches fell into.

The convincing proof that the basic foundation of the Coptic Church teaching is the collective passages of the Bible noticeable throughout her teachings.

Let us take for an example the case of faith and works. He who studies St. Paul's sayings in Rom. 4: 1-11, and Heb. 11: 17-31, decides immediately that salvation is based on faith only and is not related in any way to good works, yet when he compares them with St. James' statement in James 2: 14 and 19-26, where the Apostle quotes the same analogies of St. Paul knows that the works which the Apostle Paul refers to as supererogatory works not connected with salvation are only the personal works based on self-righteousness, whereas good conduct founded on the work of grace in the soul has full significance in our readiness for the

inheritance of the eternal kingdom. Consequently, when the sayings of both Apostles are combined they form the basis of the true doctrine, that faith in Christ is the foundation of our righteousness and justification, and that self-righteousness with all that it involves of good personal works can by no means justify a soul before God. Yet this does not imply that after justification we are not supposed to make all efforts to add virtue to our faith, 2 Pet. 3: 11, but we ought to know that faith without good works is dead, James 2: 14, and that faith by itself without good works cannot save. In short the necessity of both faith and works for salvation. And this is the doctrine which the Coptic Church teaches in consequence of taking the sayings of the Bible collected and not isolated. The other churches which conflict with her from the point of view of this teaching adhere to the sayings of St. Paul alone and ignore St. James', and also invented for themselves the teaching which says that there is no connection between the good works, even those which are the fruits of the Holy Spirit in us, and the inheritance of the eternal life. What we have seen here we also find in the case of faith and sacraments and their connection with salvation. There is, for example, the Apostolic saying "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved and thy house" (Acts 16: 31). This saying if taken alone may imply that salvation is based on faith and faith alone. But we find another Apostolic saying "Wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water; the like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us, not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God by the resurrection of Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. 3: 20 and 21). This saying affirms, that baptism saves. And when both affirmations are taken together they form the basis of the doctrine which teaches that faith and baptism are necessary for salvation, which doctrine the Master combined in His declaration "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." And this is the doctrine of the Coptic Church to which she adhered on the strength of her respect to the collective sayings of the Bible. Other churches which contend with her views on this doctrine adhere to the sayings of St. Paul only and overlook the sayings of St. Peter. Through this way grew the doctrine that sacraments are not necessary for salvation.

Such is the case in all the doctrines differed upon between the Coptic Church and other churches.

The forementioned facts confirm the claim of the Orthodox Coptic Church that in contrast with the differing churches she did not ignore in her doctrines any of the teachings of the Bible. On account of constructing her teachings on the collective and not isolated statements of the divine inspiration we trace none of the divine words overlooked in any of her teachings.

If in the case of faith and works the texts proclaiming the work of faith in salvation are viewed we find them hallowed in her teachings because she preaches and teaches the necessity of faith for salvation. So also if the texts which teach the necessity of good conduct are mentioned we find them sanctified, as well, in her teachings because she believes in the necessity of good works. Opposing churches raise their voice loud whenever a text dealing with the necessity of faith is alluded to, but they become silent when confronted with a text like St. James': "What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith and have not works? Can faith save him?" because they find that the truth announced in this text has no trace in their doctrine.

Likewise in the doctrine pertaining to the relation of sacraments to salvation, the Coptic Church is frightened neither by texts which teach faith as basis of salvation, for she combines both teachings in her doctrine. The churches which differ with her in this connection can argue and defend their doctrines when the texts on the importance of faith for salvation are viewed but, on the contrary, they feel the weakness and inefficiency of their teachings when faced with the texts which declare the importance of sacraments and their necessity for salvation and life.

The summary of what has gone before is:

First: It is essential for the affirmation of divine truth, to construct the teachings on the divine word collected and not isolated, so that doctrines may include all relative sayings in the Holy Scriptures. Any doctrine which stands on another basis is an erroneous one.

Second: The comparison between the teachings of the Coptic Church and the other churches with regard to the doctrines differed upon proves that the Coptic Church kept in loyal allegiance with this rule, and this is how her distinctive position grew so far as the conformity of her teachings with the divine inspiration is concerned.

III.—WITNESS OF HISTORY TO THE DISTINCTIVE POSITION OF THE COPTIC CHURCH.

We already explained, firstly the distinctive position of the Coptic Church in relation to the conformity of her teachings with inspiration, and, secondly, the fundamental principle of this distinction. Now we shall give the historical evidence to the full loyalty of the Coptic Church towards the preservation of the divine truth throughout all ages and times.

History witnesses that the Coptic Church manifested in various times full loyalty towards the preservation of the divine truth. In the majority of these cases the Coptic Church maintained a

distinctive stand which proved the spending of itself in defence of the divine truth and to preserve it free from blemishes of error—a fact which renders her position evidently distinctive among other churches in view of the conformity of her teachings with the divine word and makes her claim to this effect acceptable and imperatively credible.

The history of the Coptic Church differs from the histories of other churches in what is recorded in it about the lives of her heroes who appeared in different ages and times, like Athanasius and Dioscorus. Those heroes who spent their lives striving until blood for the faith once delivered to the saints. He who reads the biographies of those heroes and sees the extent of the loyalty they manifested for preserving the true faith and the zeal they displayed for it. The way she suffered bitterly in her defence, her contention with the churches' enmity of beings and governments and more particularly the controversy which rose about the unity of nature in Christ, when she valiantly took a reputable stand and revealed her steadiness and wearing herself out for the divine truth. When other churches followed the Malkite faith, she sided with the divine truth taking no heed of the enmity of the whole world nor the threatening of temporary authority. All those who read her glorious history cannot help acknowledging that the Coptic Church has distinguished herself from the other churches by a marked attitude which testifies her loyalty in preserving God's truth in her teachings. It is not surprising therefore but rather natural that she appears to-day with her distinct appearance already mentioned.

The churches have acknowledged her struggle for the truth—a thing which they did not accord to another church. They awarded one of her heroes, St. Athanasius, with the title "Defender of Right Faith"—a title which implies an evidence to the Church's maintenance of her faith and her struggle in defending it against all human errors.

Surely a church that built up her glory on the blood of her martyrs and raised her construction on the foundation of her devotedness to her faith, is not liable to be dominated by erroneous teachings as she is accused of.

Her teachings which she still firmly adheres to and her history which records for her every glory and pride do witness to the truth of her doctrines, her unblemished faith and her merit for the title she claims for herself as the "Church of Right Opinion." They also confirm the Lord's faithfulness to His promise to her which the Prophet Isaiah sang "Sing ye unto her. A vineyard of red vine. I the Lord do keep it; I will water it every moment lest any hurt it, I will keep it night and day" (Is. 27: 2-3).

A SUMMARY OF THE PROBLEM AS TO THE UNION
OF THE TWO NATURES IN CHRIST.

BY THE REVD. EIGHOMANOUS I. LUKA.

1.—THE DIFFERENCE IS CONCERNING WORDS RATHER THAN FACTS.

All churches profess one faith as to the reality of the union—that is, that the two natures were united in Christ without any confusion, confounding, change or separation. The allegation of the churches that the Coptic Church teaches the confusion of the two natures is untrue, as is shown by many of her confessions and among them the closing one of the mass, and also by her rejection of the Eutykhan heresy that taught the confusion of the two natures in Christ.

The appearance of difference is merely a matter of viewpoint. Other churches say that because the natures were not confused it is necessary to keep them separate and not to attribute to the one the attributes of the other; that those deeds proceeding from Divinity pertain to His Divinity while those pertaining to humanity belong to His humanity. The Coptic Church asserts that while the two natures were not confused, yet, because of their perfect union (in Christ) and because of the value of His sacrifice and its atoning character are based upon this union, the body which suffered and died is united with Divinity in complete oneness, there must not be made any separation in regard to the works proceeding from either of the two natures, but, on the contrary, there should be the recognition that what happened to the one happened also to the other, and that what is done by the one should be considered as done by the other.

2.—THE VALIDITY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE COPTIC CHURCH.

We establish the Coptic doctrine by the following considerations:—

(a) *Logically.* The sacrifice of Christ has the value of propitiation made for the whole world because it was a Divine Sacrifice and not an ordinary human one. If we consider all the sufferings, death and blood-shedding to be merely human we strip the sacrifice of all its value and weaken the foundations upon which are built its singularity and sufficiency. We are compelled by our assertion of the value of that Sacrifice to confess that it was not human but Divine, that is, the Sacrifice of the body which was perfectly united to Divinity. This does not mean that we believe that Divinity itself suffered and died, but that we say that the sufferings and the death which came upon the humanity in Christ came also

upon the Incarnate God without separation or Division, because the fullness of Divinity dwelt in the body in which He suffered and died, and as both (the human and the Divine) were perfectly united. We affirm that this consideration is the foundation of the Atonement and that upon it depends all the power and the value of that Sacrifice.

(b) *The Sacred Word of Inspiration.* This Orthodox doctrine of the Coptic Church is evident in the many clear utterances which attribute the human aspects of suffering, weeping, blood and death to Divinity.

Acts 20: 28, speaks of the blood which was shed as the blood of God Himself.

1 Cor. 11: 8, speaks of the crucified Jesus as the Lord of Glory.

John 3: 13, attributes to the Son of Man what belongs to the Divine Person, *i.e.*, descending from heaven, being in heaven and ascending to heaven.

Heb. 5: 7, makes the strong crying and tears acts of Divinity, using, therefore, the expression "In the days of His flesh."

(c) *The Confession of Churches Denying the Coptic Doctrine.*

These churches name the Virgin Mary "The Mother of God" as also does the Coptic Church. It being understood that Divinity is not subject to birth, we find in this expression the assumption that what applies to Christ's humanity applies also to His Divinity—which indeed is the assumption of the Coptic Church. We find in this explanation emanating from other churches what satisfies us and makes unnecessary further proof that the Coptic Orthodox doctrine is accurate. It is quite fair to say, as we believe, that these churches must either abandon their confession for the sake of their opinion, or they must cling to it—in which case they must accept the veracity of the mind of the Coptic Church.

THE SYRIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH.

BY CANON W. A. WIGRAM.

THE shock of the War, and even more the atmosphere of utter uncertainty that has followed on the "Peace" that was apparently the best that the world's statesmen could achieve, still causes endless suffering to the Christian Churches of the East. Readers of *The Christian East* are aware of the disgraceful story of the dealings of our Government and of the League of Nations, with those Assyrians to whom they promised a home. There are

others, however, whose sufferings, if less spectacular, are still severe enough, and among these are the members of the Orthodox Syrian Church of the East. The name "Orthodox" is a little confusing to English readers, as we are apt to apply it only to the Greek Church and to those in communion with it. In this connection, however, it means those children of the Monophysite or Jacobite Communion who have remained faithful to the Church of their fathers and have not left her for any other jurisdiction.

How far they are what we mean by "Monophysite" is a tangled question. Certainly these Syriac-speaking Christians, in their resentment of the fact that the Government of the Church had in the fifth century become predominantly Greek, refused to accept the "Ecthesis" of the Council of Chalcedon, which they called—not unjustly—"an imperialistic gathering."

On the other hand, they anathematize the unlucky heretic Eutyches condemned at Chalcedon, and certainly do not hold the doctrine condemned as his by the council, that the humanity of Christ was swallowed up and annihilated by its union with the Divine, "as a drop of vinegar is lost if it is thrown into the sea." On the contrary, if they do feel unable to speak of "Christ in two natures," and prefer the Cyrilline formula of "One Nature that became incarnate," they do assert that the "Ousiai" or "essences" of the Divine and the Human remain "Truly, Perfectly, Inseparably, Unconfusedly" in the one person of the Redeemer. To call such people "Monophysite" in the sense in which a lecturer to students is apt to use that term is not just.

Before the War, practically the whole of this Church was within the Turkish Empire. It is true that historical accidents in the sixteenth century had induced the Christians of Malabar, who had previously been "Nestorian," to range themselves under the "Monophysite" banner. That, however, was simply because Roman Catholics, controlling Portuguese officials in South India, had cut the "Christians of St. Thomas" off from their legitimate head, and drove them to seek for Bishops from any Church that was not Papal. The fact shows how completely the doctrinal question had ceased to tell. The bulk of the Church was in Syria and Mesopotamia, under a Patriarch who always took the name of Ignatius in memory of the days when he could claim to be the lawful holder of the See of Antioch, and resided at "Deir Zafaran," "the Yellow Monastery" near to the City of Mardin.

The War not only inflicted terrible sufferings on the people, though they personally took no share in it; it also, by its results, divided the members of the nation under at least four separate jurisdictions. Some were still left in a diminished Turkey, some gathered round their ancient sanctuary in Jerusalem, and so came under the British Mandate in Palestine. A larger portion found

themselves under French jurisdiction in Syria, and a remnant were left in Mesopotamia, in the new kingdom of Iraq. The division of the Ottoman Empire was professedly made on national lines! The Patriarch was driven from his historic home, and obliged to find a residence which he and all his entourage hope will be only a temporary one, at Homs, on the Orontes.

An account, that his old home had been destroyed, proved fictitious. Neither the monastery, nor the historic IVth century Church at St. James at Nosibis seem to have received serious damage, and there are even a handful of faithful monks still residing in the former, though the new regime in Turkey insists that they shall wear lay dress of European pattern, instead of their proper habits. That is the order of the man who now rules Turkey and who is driving, not to say kicking,* his subjects along the road of what he supposes to be progress and civilization.

The Patriarch recently asked leave to return to the house which had been the abode of those who held his office, since a time long before the arrival of the Turk in the country; and after long delay received the reply, "The Ruler of Turkey deals only with appeals and requests made to him by Turkish subjects." So for the present, his Grace remains in the city of Homs. His residence at that city is a manifest make-shift, though it may prove that sort of make-shift that lasts for many years. It is in fact a school house, in the courtyard of the local Church of St. Mary the Virgin. The church is modern and uninteresting enough, but the site is old, for it contains a holy well, which is said to have healing powers for all who come to it on the patronal festival of the church, and is visited then by the sick of all faiths, including Christian, Mussulman and Druse. Our Lady is said to have visited the place when on earth, and to have left her girdle as a memorial, a relic that is still preserved under the altar, but not exhibited.

Here resides the Patriarch, Ephraim Ignatius, whom the writer had the privilege of knowing as "Rahib Ephraim" at Deir Zaferan, in those pre-war days that now seem to those who remember them like some previous existence. In those days, residents in Turkey thought of Abdul Hamid as a tyrant, and imagined that no massacres could be more terrible than those which he had perpetrated on the hapless Armenians. We had much to learn then, and had not realized that the savagery of the Turkish conservative is as water to alcohol when you compare him to the Turkish reformer, and that the worst atrocity that Abdul Hamid ever designed, did not cause one-tenth of the slaughter or of the

* An unfortunate station-master, having to receive Mustapha Atatürk and a foreign ambassador on his station platform, did so wearing the forbidden fez. Mustapha seeing him, sprang from the train in fury, and literally kicked the station-master from one end of the platform to the other! The writer was informed of this picturesque episode by an eye-witness.

horror implied in the massacres carried out during the War on the Armenians by Talaat, or after the War by Mustapha Kemal on the Greeks.

The writer then knew "Rahib Ephraim" as a studious young monk in Syria, and had the pleasure of encountering him a little later in London, whither he had come to consult the Syriac authorities in the British Museum in studies in the history of his church. Rahib Ephraim then wished to find the writer of this article, but did not know his address. Therefore with oriental patience he sat him down among the parchments in the "Oriental Manuscripts Dept.," and waited and studied, till his friend should come thither. We rejoice to say that his patience was rewarded, and that after forty days there was a happy meeting in that branch of the Library.

The Rahib then confessed the difficulty a poor oriental, fresh from the hill of Mardin, found in finding his way in the maze and roar of London. "Oh, if ever you are in a difficulty, ask for the help of a policeman," said the writer. Painful memories of the life of a "rayah" under the Turk came out in the answer, "Ask a policeman! I wouldn't dream of going near one!" And now, in the autumn of this year, after some thirty years' interval, we found him again, as the Patriarch of his diminished and suffering people doing his best to guide them aright in the troubled post-war world, where all old standards and land-marks seem to have vanished.

In his province as Archbishop, Ignatius Ephraim has now four Bishops, including himself, those of Aleppo, Beyrout and Damascus. There are also two more in Iraq, viz., at Mosul, and the holder of the titular dignity of "Mafrian," at the ancient monastery of Mar Mattai.

*Mafrian, we may mention, is the title of what other churches would call an autonomous archbishop. In days when Christians in this land were many, before the rise of Islam, and when Mesopotamia was part of a separate kingdom, under the Sassanid kings of Persia, Christians in that land could not be under the same jurisdiction as those who were subject to the Roman Emperor, for good practical reasons. Hence the rise of the "Nestorian" patriarchate, and the "Jacobites" there also had their presiding Archbishop, the Mafrian. Even including those in Iraq, the number of the faithful of this church does not exceed 50,000 in all, and may indeed be less. This does not include the Christians of Travancore, who form a separate question.

The Patriarch is now most justifiably anxious for the future of his small community. While the French mandate over Syria lasted, it is true that all positions and advantages went first to Moslems, and after that to Romanists of the various hierarchies

—Latin, and "Uniate" of various kinds. Among these the Maronite is considerably the larger, as it is the most ancient.

The Greek Orthodox and the Syrian Orthodox—the more educated we must own—were left out in the cold, and the heads of these two bodies, old rivalry forgotten, now usually act together. Still, there was personal safety, and a large measure of liberty for all Christians. Now, Syria has been declared independent, and the mandate closed. We met long columns of troops of France's African army en route to the sea, and police barracks now blaze with bright new paint bearing the inscription "Republique de Syrie." What will this new Government be like to its "rayahs"? It promises, of course, freedom, equality and *Carriere Ouverte* to all, but the Patriarch has seen too much not to be doubtful. "You and I have known just such promises given before, my friend, in 1908 for instance. Did we find them worth much then?"

Here is one problem that may serve as a test for these new rulers. Will they allow the Orthodox Syrians and other minorities their own schools and colleges? The Patriarch has just been collecting funds from his own people for a seminary for ordinands in a village not far from Baalbek, and the French had promised full permission to open this. Will it be given now? It has been delayed for the moment, on plea of press of business. The fact is true, of course, but the excuse has a disagreeably familiar ring.

The French, we must own, have given freedom of action to the Church. Twice they have allowed councils to meet—a thing that is known to be utterly impossible in Turkey. One of these councils was for the patriarchal election, the other—at which the presiding Archbishop of Malabar was present—to discuss the affairs of the church in that Province. Unfortunately, a Government that is entirely Moslem has not yet learned to trust, or to regard as fellow-citizens, those whom every Moslem still thinks of as "rayahs"—subjects. Nor is this attitude quite inexcusable. The Christians have still minds moulded by centuries of Turkish rule. "We love the land. How can we be expected to love the Government?" said even the Patriarch.

The relations of the Patriarchate with the church in Malabar still remain uncertain, and unsettled by the council referred to above. They have always been thorny and are complicated by personal quarrels. The late Patriarch, Ignatius Abdullah, went down to Malabar during the period of French rule in Syria (another proof of freedom, by the way, for no Œcumenical Patriarch can ever quit Turkey), in the hope that his personal presence would solve the question, particularly as he hoped to secure a "firman" from King George—in which he was disappointed. Whether he would have been able to effect anything remains uncertain, for he fell ill and died soon after arrival. The Archbishop Dionysius

was much inclined then to proclaim himself Patriarch of the ancient church in Malabar; he was dissuaded from that step, but he continued to act as if he was completely independent, and though he did consent to attend the synod referred to above, nothing was settled there. We give the Patriarch's account of the difficulty, and of what was done. "I would have asked the synod to make him full Mafrian of Malabar, had he requested that. He said, however, that he could not ask for what was his by right. I do not think that he ought to assume what only the church can grant." That is the verdict of the Patriarch, and it describes how the matter stands now. The position is closely and dangerously parallel to that of the Bulgarians in the Greek Orthodox Communion. There too a national body has grasped at independence, which the Mother Church now sees to be a necessity, and would grant—if only the revolting daughter would condescend to ask for it. In both cases, pride forbids the making of the request that what has been taken should now be given.

OUR BOOKSHELF

CHURCH AND STATE ON THE EUROPEAN
CONTINENT.

By ADOLF KELLER, D.D., LL.D. The Epworth Press, 1936.

THE relations between Church and State have undergone most radical transformation in most European countries since the War. In some cases they have become friendlier, *i.e.*, France, Italy and the Balkans, but in others they have changed and there is now an open conflict, *i.e.*, Russia, Germany and Spain. Professor Keller has a unique knowledge of the European situation and his book presents extraordinarily well-documented information as to the actual state of the various churches in the different parts of Europe. His main attention is given to the Protestant denominations but he displays an equal impartiality and a real grasp of his subject when he writes about the Eastern Orthodox or the Roman Catholic Churches. His book can be recommended to all those who want to understand better the religious and political situation on the Continent.

N. ZERNOV.

THE RUSSIAN CHURCH.

BY I. N. DANZAS. Sheed and Ward, 1937. 3s. 6d.

THE Church of Russia is a subject which attracts a good deal of attention at present. Few churches have been so bitterly criticized and so often misunderstood as that of Russia and in spite of books and articles published on it, it still remains an enigmatic body for the large majority of, even well read, Western Christians.

Miss Danzas' book represents an attempt to describe the Russian Church from the standpoint of a convert to Rome and it deserves the attention of all those who are interested in Russia and in the relations between the Roman Catholic and other Churches.

The author knows well the facts of Russian history and narrates them in a clear and attractive way, but the picture of Russian Christianity drawn by her contains several statements which show that she fails to grasp their real meaning. These instances are particularly frequent where the Eastern Church presents its own interpretation of Christianity equally distinct from both Western Catholicism and Protestantism. Miss Danzas refuses to recognize the existence of the independent Eastern tradition and she tries to explain the difference between Rome and the Russian Church as the result of misunderstanding. She writes for instance, "The insurmountable wall between the Russian religious consciousness and the Catholic idea is purely a matter of misconception" (p. 61).

Miss Danzas uses only two colours, black for all that is non-Roman and shining white for her own Church and this leads her into a position where she is obliged to describe every element in Russian theology or practice which is non-consonant with Rome as "Protestant." So the Slavophil movement of the nineteenth century, which was a rediscovery of the genuine Orthodox tradition for Russian theology, is called by Miss Danzas, the "Lutherinization" of the Russian Church (p. 123). A. Khomiakov, one of the most stimulating Russian theologians of the nineteenth century, is charged with "ignorance of the theology of his own Church" (p. 123). Every manifestation of opposition to Rome is explained on the ground of either personal hostility or lack of knowledge. Miss Danzas seems to be firmly convinced that no member of the Russian Church could remain unconverted to Rome if only he had a chance of hearing her message.

There are various ways of conducting Christian controversy, and one of the most disappointing among them is to refuse to take the convictions of the opponents seriously and to ascribe their refusal to agree to their bad will or ignorance. The first step towards the understanding of the other person's position is only reached when

the fact of a difference is accepted. It is quite futile to insist any longer that the fundamental difference between the Roman and the Orthodox conception of Catholicity and Church authority is the mere result of obstinacy of Eastern theologians, and it is a pity that this well-documented and ably written book repeats the mistake which has frustrated so many other attempts at mutual understanding between the Eastern Orthodox and the Roman Catholic Christians.

NICOLAS ZERNOV.

NEW RUMANIAN PUBLICATIONS.

Jesus Christ—A Harmony of the Four Gospels (Iisus Hristos—Sfintele Evanghelii intr'una), compiled by the Rev. H. Popescu, The "Pace" Publishing Co., Bucharest.

Resurrection Bells (Clopotele Invierii), a collection of short stories by the Rev. Gh. Butnaru, The "Pace" Publishing Co., Bucharest.

The Hymnographic Poetry of the Books of Ritual and the Church Songs (Despre Poezia Imnografica din Cartile de Ritual si Cantarea Bisericeasca), by the Rev. P. Vintilescu, The "Pace" Publishing Co., Bucharest.

THE "Pace" Publishing Co., of Bucharest, is a small but flourishing concern very ably conducted by Fr. Galdau, one of the most capable and energetic of the younger Rumanian clergy. Fr. Galdau's purpose has been to produce a series of works on the Christian Faith in first-rate modern bindings and at a reasonable price in order to help ordinary religious people and particularly educated young men and women. In this he has succeeded admirably, as these three volumes prove.

The first work is a Harmony of the Gospels intended especially for the student type and youth generally. It is the first serious attempt along these lines, and so beautifully printed and illustrated that within four weeks of publication the first edition of 3,000 copies was exhausted. As the Vicar of the Rumanian Patriarchate says in his foreword: "The artistic illustrations in this work will contribute in a very great measure not only to the enjoyment of reading the text, but also—most of all—to its understanding and thus to the fuller knowledge of God's truth and of Jesus Christ, Who came from Him."

Resurrection Bells is a series of short sketches about the two most important events in our Christian life—Christmas and Easter, by Fr. Butnaru of Domnita Balasa Church in Bucharest.

The volume takes its title from a very beautifully written incident in the life of the Schoolmaster Dumistrascu. Originally under the influence of a materialistic philosophy of the universe, he begins to read the Bible. There he is struck by the references to great men dying, and gradually he realises that the only satisfactory philosophy of life is one which proclaims immortality. His last doubts are removed when as a convalescent from a serious illness he hears the "Resurrection Bells" of Easter.

Fr. Vintilescu's book, being as it is the work of a Professor in the Faculty of Theology of the University of Bucharest, is a very solid but pleasantly written study of the subject. The author has utilised works not only in the ancient languages and Rumanian, but also in French, German, Modern Greek and English, and bases his conclusions on a thorough study of early and Byzantine documents. We are convinced that this volume will, as Fr. Vintilescu modestly hopes in his Preface, "contribute in a new form to the greater understanding of the Church's Service Books, of the precious treasures contained in them and of the spirit of our religious singing."

We congratulate the "Pace" Publishing Co. on the high level of their productions. May they long continue to publish such valuable works for the religious life of Rumania!

E.N.C.S.

